Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-243
Friday
18 December 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-243 *18 December 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov Notes Summit Disagreements, Problems *[Paris LE FIGARO 16 Dec]* 1
U.S. Team Departs To Inspect Soviet Radar Site 1
Medium-Range Missile Forces Delineated *[APN MILITARY BULLETIN No 23]* 1
Pact-NATO Naval Comparison Listed *[APN MILITARY BULLETIN No 23]* 2
Further on End of Chemical Weapons Talks 2
Karpov Condemns U.S. Production of CW Shells 2
Kozyakov Hits Production of Binary Weapons 3
With SS-20 Convoy, Writer Reflects on Treaty *[Prokhanov in PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Addresses Journalists at Press Centre 7
Results of Washington Summit 7
Disputes Carlucci's Remarks 7
Condemns U.S. CW Production 8
Praises Turkish Stand on INF 8
Soviet Arms to Central America 8
ASEAN-CEMA Cooperation 9
ROK Elections, Rust Case 9
Examines UN Gulf Navy Proposal 9
Previews King Husayn Visit 9
General Batenin, Experts Hold Media Conference 10
USSR Position on SDI Unchanged 10
U.S. Policy Toward Mideast 10
Settlement of Afghan Problem 11
PRC Nuclear Potential 11
Pyadyshev on Assertions Over Nicaraguan Aid 11
UK Maintains Arms Sales Mission in Iran 11
CEMA-EEC Trade Colloquium Opens in Brussels 11
USSR Criticizes UN Council Vote on Micronesia 12
USSR Peace Committee Sets Up Debating Society 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

IZVESTIYA Interviews House Speaker Wright *[15 Dec]* 13
Dole Announces Support for INF Treaty 15
Gus Hall: Treaty 'Symbol of Things To Come' 16
Environmental Protection Agreement Signed 16
Kornilov Criticizes Berlin Wall Propaganda 16
Yakovlev Contributes Article to New Journal 17
Deaver 'False Testimony' Conviction Reported 17

China

PRC To Set Up Sociological Research Service 17
Corretions to Articles on PRC, USSR Reform 18

Northeast Asia

ROK Presidential Elections, Future Viewed *[Levin, Andrianov]* 18
USSR Official on Coastal Trade With Japan 19

Near East & South Asia

USSR's Marshal Akhromeyev To Visit India *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Dec]* 19
Petrovskiy Briefs Gandhi on U.S.-USSR Summit 19
DRA Protests Pakistani Firing at Patrol Plane 20
Morocco's Benaissa Arrives in USSR 15 Dec *[Rabar MAP]* 20

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopia's Mengistu, Soviet Envoy View Summit 20
Angola's Dos Santos Receives Soviet Envoys 20
ANC's Simon Mokana Opens Mission in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 20
Ivanova, CPSU Delegation Arrives in Madagascar *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 21
USSR Delegation Returns From Ghana 15 Dec *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 21

East Europe

CPCZ Replacement of Husak Reported *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 21
More on Husak Replacement 21
Gorbachev Congratulates Jakes 22
PRAVDA on Conclusion of RCP National Conference *[17 Dec]* 22
Hungarian Unemployment Solutions Outlined *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 23

West Europe

Shultz Briefs Britain's Thatcher on INF Treaty 25
Britain Offers To Accept More U.S. Jets 25
Confidence Vote for Chirac Government Assessed *[V. Bolshakov in PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 26
Karpov Meets French President, Other Officials 26
FRG Defense Minister Cited on NATO Activities 26
Soviets Brief Europeans on Summit Results 27
Swedish Politicians Informed 27
Belgium's Tindemans Briefed 27
Meeting With Italy's Cossiga 28
Talks With Turkey's Halefoglu 28
Greek Prime Minister Briefed 28
U.S. Bases in Turkey, Mediterranean Discussed 28
Significance of INF Agreement to Turkey Viewed *[A. Zlatorunskiy]* 29
Briefs 29
Taxation Agreement With Belgium 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Politburo Approves INF Treaty; Hears Zaykov 30
Ryzhkov Tours Alma-Ata Pulp Combine 31
Dolgikh Attends Communications Collegium 31
MOSCOW NEWS Discusses Yeltsin Case 32
Ukrainian CP Disciplines Officials *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 6 Dec]* 32
Moldavian Secretary Replies to Criticism *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 33
Yaroslavl Auto Workers Protest Work Schedules 34
Kamchatka Inhabitants Protest Research Work 34
Commission Examines Antipollution Efforts *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 34
Poll Concludes Majority Support Perestroyka 35
Religious Leaders Hold 'Traditional Meeting' 35

Leningrad Human Rights Group Member Jailed *[AFP]* 36
Timofeyev Announces Monitoring Group *[AFP]* 36
Tolkunov Queried on Human Rights Day 37
Withdrawals of Emigration Requests Noted 38
Refuseniks Accused of Disrupting Peace Rally *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 38
U.S. Citing False Figures on Refuzniks *[AFP]* 39
Amnesties Effect on Moscow Crime Reported *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* 40
Citizens Interviewed About Street Crimes 40
Antidrugs Chief on Combatting Addiction 41
Housing Swindles, Scandals Uncovered 42
American Videotape 'Smuggler' Caught *[Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA 13 Nov]* 42
Reappraisal of Bukharin Role Demanded *[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]* 43
Volkogonov Examines the 'Stalin Phenomenon' *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 9 Dec]* 46
OGONEK Editor Comments on Reforms, Yeltsin *[Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD 11 Dec]* 52
NOVYY MIR To Continue Publishing 'Shelved' Works *[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]* 53
Writer Abramov's 1964 Speech Published *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Dec]* 54
Scholars, Writers Argue on Nuclear Retaliation *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 10 Dec]* 57
Briefs 64
New Television Transmitter 64

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts' 'Fatigue' 'Building Up' 64
Ship Reaches Antarctic Despite Hitting Rock 64

Military

Defense Minister Yazov Addresses Writers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Dec]* 64
Soviets 'To Scrap' Nuclear Submarines in Baltic *[AFP]* 67

Karpov Notes Summit Disagreements, Problems

PM171628 Paris LE FIGARO in French 16 Dec 87 p 4

[Pierre Bocev report: "Washington Did Not Solve Everything"]

[Text] $E=MC^2$. For Einstein the question is settled. Not for Reagan and Gorbachev. Is their equation ABM equals SDI? To put it more clearly: Does the reference to the 1972 ABM Treaty cover the problem of President Reagan's SDI? The White House and Kremlin analyses on this crucial point obviously still differ.

The Washington summit achieved less progress than people originally thought or pretended to think on the major disarmament issues which are still unresolved: Star Wars and the START treaty on a 50% reduction in strategic arsenals. Viktor Karpov, who is responsible for these questions in Moscow's Foreign Ministry, explained during a stopover in Paris yesterday that the compromise reached at the summit was simply a verbal compromise and did not solve the fundamental problems. Moreover, at Mikhail Gorbachev's request, he informed President Mitterrand about the Washington summit.

The formula adopted in Washington, which almost held up the farewell ceremony at the last minute, is certainly vague. The United States and the USSR say they have "instructed" their negotiators to "draw up an agreement which would force the two sides to respect the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 while carrying out research, development, and tests as required and permitted by the ABM Treaty," which the two sides promise not to annul for a specified period. The U.S. interpretation is simple. In Ronald Reagan's view, the Washington communique "solved" the problem of the SDI or Star Wars.

The Kremlin's Gamble [subhead]

It is not as simple as that, Viktor Karpov retorted yesterday. "There is only one solution: strict and full respect for the ABM Treaty as signed. The Americans wanted to include in the communique that they had the right not only to carry out research but to carry out tests in space. We oppose that, because the ABM Treaty prohibits such experiments. Either Washington stands by the pledge not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for a period, which we would like to be 10 years, or there will be no START agreement" on strategic reductions.

Despite the complexity of the subject, the basic problem is relatively simple. Ronald Reagan thinks he has secured a free hand to test the futurist elements of his SDI. Mikhail Gorbachev states that this is not the case.

The Kremlin's gamble seems to be threefold. First, thanks to Congress, the most controversial aspects of the SDI are very limited for the next year and hence virtually until the end of Reagan's term of office. Second, nobody knows whether the new White House incumbent will attach as much importance to Star Wars. Finally, if a START agreement was within reach in a few months' time, Washington would be under considerable pressure to make concessions on the SDI in order to sign the START agreement.

However, Viktor Karpov's statements pointed to the scale of the disagreements which exist in the strategic sphere itself, aside from the SDI problem.

For instance, the Soviet diplomat not only reaffirmed that there is still disagreement on "sub-ceilings" for each category of weapons, but he also revealed that a new disagreement emerged on the method of counting heavy bombers and their armaments. Agreement in this sphere had been reached at the previous summit in Reykjavik in 1986. But, he said, the United States has just introduced a new method of counting which "would be very clearly to its advantage and to the detriment of Soviet arsenals."

Is this just affected pessimism? Is it disappointment following a summit from which more had been expected? Does it herald a real deadlock?

U.S. Team Departs To Inspect Soviet Radar Site

LD180522 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0431 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Washington, 18 December (TASS)—TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin reports:

A group of U.S. experts who, at the proposal of the Soviet Union, will carry out an on-site inspection of the "Pawn Shop" radar vans in the Moscow and Gomel areas, left the United States for the USSR on Thursday. The United States has claimed that these installations have been sited there in violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty, even though this does not correspond with the facts, and there are no grounds whatsoever for such claims.

However, taking into account the U.S. side's anxiety, the USSR invited U.S. experts as long ago as on 14-16 December [as received] to visit these installations and to familiarize themselves with them. Because of its commitments, the U.S. side was unable to accept this inspection date. It suggested to the U.S. side that it make the journey later, that it increase the size of its group of experts, and that it take photographs at the site.

Medium-Range Missile Forces Delineated

PM171419 Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No 23 Nov 87 p 1

["Soviet Medium-Range Nuclear Weapons"—APN MILITARY BULLETIN headline]

[Text] According to the information avaliable to Military Bulletin, the Soviet Union had the following medium-range nuclear forces as of January 1, 1987:

The Number of Nuclear Medium-Range Weapons in the European Part of the USSR

ground-based missiles (SS-4, SS-20)	355
including: SS-4	112
SS-20	243
sea-based missiles	18
medium-range bombers	507
Total number of medium-range nuclear weapons	880

Tactical and Technical Characteristics of Medium-Range Nuclear Weapons

A. Medium-Range Missiles

	SS-4	SS-20	SS-N-5
year of phasing into service	1959	1976	1963
number of warheads	1	3	1
range (km)	2000	4000	1400
type of launcher	stationary	mobile	mobile (on subs)

B. Medium-range Aircraft

	TU-16 (Badger)	TU-22K (Blinder)	TU-22M (Backfire)
year of phasing into service	1955	1963	1974
practical ceiling (m)	12,800	12,500	14,000
maximal speed (km/hour)	920	1500	1800
combat range (km)	1900	2100	2200
rate of production (number of aircraft per annum)			30

Pact-NATO Naval Comparison Listed

PM171427 Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No 23, Nov 87 p 2

["Correlation of Navies of Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO Was As Follows"—APN MILITARY BULLETIN headline]

[Text]

	Warsaw Treaty	(USSR)	NATO	(USA)
1. Aircraft carriers and air-capable ships	2	(2)	25	(20)
2. Submarines	385	(377)	279	(128)
3. Battleships, cruisers, destroyers and missile frigates	107	(106)	300	(145)
4. Frigates and small antisubmarine ships	187	(168)	319	(99)
5. Boats and mine-sweepers	1059	(735)	711	(168)
6. Landing ships and boats	132	(86)	541	(160)
Total Number of Warships	1872	(1474)	2175	(720)
1. Aircraft carriers and air-capable ships	2	(2)	25	(20)
2. Submarines	385	(377)	279	(128)
7. Warplanes and helicopter gunships	1126	(1040)	3173	(2530)
8. Marines (thousands)		(12)		(190)

The MILITARY BULLETIN editorial board plans to publish comparable data on the strategic nuclear forces of the USSR and the USA in the next issue.

Further on End of Chemical Weapons Talks

LD172210 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Geneva December 17 TASS—The seventh round of bilateral consultations of the USSR and the USA on chemical weapons ban ended here today. The consultations are held in accordance with the arrangement reached at the Geneva summit in November 1985.

During the round the sides discussed some problems whose solution would speed up the conclusion of an appropriate international convention. An important stimulus to this was given by an arrangement recorded in the joint Soviet-American statement in Washington about the need for intensified negotiations toward conclusion of a truly global and verifiable convention on general and complete ban on chemical weapons. A speedy drafting of such a document would be the continuation of the process of real disarmament the beginning to which was set by the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. Local observers note, however, that as the draft convention assumes more real contours, the U.S. side makes obvious attempts to drag out the talks and limit itself to partial measures instead of a complete ban and also seeks not to apply the convention to a part of industrial enterprises which could continue secretly producing such weapons. The United States decision to start the production of binary weapons does nothing to promote the advance toward the ban on chemical weapons.

The next round of the consultations will be held early in 1988.

Karpov Condemns U.S. Production of CW Shells

LD180839 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—By a TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The United States started on December 17 production of 155-mm artillery binary chemical shells.

A TASS diplomatic correspondent asked Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department on Arms Control and Disarmament, to say how this step might affect prospects of concluding a convention banning chemical weapons.

"The effect of this step undertaken by the United States can only be negative," Karpov said. "The U.S. programme of binary chemical rearmament questions the very intention of that country to conclude a convention that would prohibit and destroy chemical weapons.

It is at odds with the commitment of the American leader, expressed during the recent meeting with the Soviet leader, to working out a verifiable, comprehensive and effective convention on this account. The two leaders reaffirmed in Washington the need for more intensive talks to conclude such a convention.

It is apparent that this declaration demands confirmation by practical deeds by both countries. As to the Soviet Union, it has ceased the production of chemical weapons. It has no binary weapons.

In the talks, we put forward a number of proposals paving the way for drafting the convention as early as in 1988. On the other hand, the United States is starting the production of a new type of chemical weapons and is pursuing a course towards delaying the talks.

A legitimate question arises: What does the United States want? I think that the hasty start of binary weapon production soon after the Washington summit confirms the observation made by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in Washington that the American side would like to depart from the goal agreed upon in Geneva, that of banning all chemical weapons, and to keep binary types out of a would-be ban.

Otherwise, what is the sense in wasting money on arms that would be subject to elimination anyway?"

"I want to reiterate in this connection," Karpov observed, "That the Soviet Union remains committed to the opinion that the convention currently being elaborated in Geneva should totally ban all chemical weapons—unitary and binary."

Kozyakov Hits Production of Binary Weapons

LD180416 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] The United States has begun manufacturing new generation chemical weapons, known as binary weapons. Here is a commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov:

A mere week ago at the Washington summit a shared commitment was voiced to conclude a comprehensive and effective convention on banning and eliminating chemical weapons. This was reflected in the joint Soviet-American statement at the summit. The document says that the two leaders called for more intensive talks on the issue and for greater openness and more confidence-building measures with respect to chemical weapons. The statement was welcomed by parties to the talks within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, who are discussing a draft convention in the hope that the barriers that are in the way of adopting it will be overcome.

One of such barriers is that while calling for a total ban on chemical weapons, United States representatives voice the desire to leave binary chemical weapons outside the scope of a convention. Where is the logic? One hundred and fifty-five millimeter binary rounds, whose production began in the United States yesterday, are filled with the GB nerve gas, which causes death 1 minute after it's inhaled. The question is: Why has the United States started the production of a new generation chemical weapon while the Soviet Union has stopped the production of chemical weapons?

It would seem that enough progress has been made as far as verification and openness are concerned to make banning these weapons a reality. In October representatives of scores of countries, including the United States, visited the Soviet military facility in Shikhany where they were shown Soviet chemical weapons as well as equipment and procedures for eliminating them. Soviet experts and diplomats later visited the chemical weapons base in Tooele, Utah.

Proposals for verification tabled by the Soviet Union and other countries provide for the most stringent procedures, including on-site inspection; but here too problems emerge. United States representatives at the talks agreed to extend verification to state run production facilities only. This would cover all Soviet production facilities and practically none on the American side because all such facilities in this country are state run while in the United States most of them are in private hands.

The United States' stand may also be related to United States efforts to exclude binary weapons, whose production began in the United States yesterday, from the scope of a chemical weapons ban.

With SS-20 Convoy, Writer Reflects on Treaty

PM181141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Report by Aleksandr Prokhanov: "RSD-10: Thoughts at the Launch Position"; the report is accompanied by a photograph (6.5 inches by 4 inches) which, according to the caption, is "an RSD-10 missile launcher, published for the first time"]

[Excerpts] Strategic Missile Forces, December, 1987—There it is, a medium-ranger, an RSD-10, as it is called in Soviet missile records, an SS-20, as the NATO military call it. A massive, dull green tube ending in a blunt

hemisphere, lying on the back of a powerful missile carrier. Two glass-windowed cabins, like two dragons stretched out headfirst. A dozen corrugated wheels reminiscent of strong claws. A long torso with prominent ribs. A living, breathing mass filled with measured transfusions of heat, electricity, and a multitude of signals marching about its innards, penetrating its muscles, an abdomen filled with fuel, its sleepy, slumbering head, where the explosion lurks. When the launch command is given the massive vessel will rear up, shooting out a column of fire from its rear. It will go to its target, capable of turning a city, clusters of industrial plants, and missiles base into poisonous conflagrations. [passage omitted]

A division of medium-range missiles which come under the treaty on their total destruction...

Night. Snow falling. The division leaves its stationing area. Lights flickering dimly. Combat crews at the double. The dull glint of submachine guns. Shadows in the snowstorm. The deputy political commander, shining a lamp on unfolded page, takes in the strategic military situation in the world. At that moment the two world leaders were in Washington signing a treaty: Flowers, stamped paper, exploding flash bulbs, applause...

The doors of the installations open. The floodlights are on. The monsters with their bulging black backs, crawl out of their stalls.

I look at the hulking shapes, trying to protect myself from the knifing wind. I reflect: Two trends in world history have met up, come together, and started to separate and part. One is linked to the idea of force, retribution, fear, revenge, domoination, total defense, total war, a futile all-consuming stoicism that lays waste mankind, the earth, and the universe itself. The other is associated with a different kind of potential: prosperity, goodness, universal fraternity...

I would venture to say that in recent months, weeks, and hours there has been a fundamental discovery in the world, in an area where they have been no previous discoveries. Not in physics, not in psychology, not in military strategy, not in the social or economic sphere, but in what is known as global policy—but what is in fact the totality of human life, with all its institutions, countless goals, movements, and categories. It is in this sphere that catastrophes roost, conflicts multiply, form part of the general world drama, and bring life to a halt. People have tried to understand and rationalize this sphere and remove from it the elements of disaster, destruction, and global death. But it has not yielded, it has evaded understanding and has responded to all efforts to control it with a new, lengthening chain of catastrophes. Now a discovery has been made. The Washington treaty is its result.

The new thinking is an unexpected, untraditional view of, a kind of insight into, our earthly existence which has made it possible suddenly to discover a hidden law, a homologous theory, a Mendeleyev table and, on the basis of the first discovery, design the first real, global-political machine—that very treaty.

We have a right to expect further gripping discoveries, applying them to arms in general, to local wars, to economic anomalies and ecological crises, and to the entire concept of confrontation. We have a right to expect these unique discoveries to turn into unprecedented structures regulating the life of the terrestrial community.

That is what happened at the start of the scientific and technical revolution, when there was a series of discoveries in science, immediately giving rise to technical inventions. It will be so now, at the start of the global-humanitarian revolution which promises us a new world order based on common sense and goodness. Its engineers and architects are each of us, plowman and leader of the country, soldier, poet, and philosopher. For it is through our energy, prayers, meticulous research, and sacrifices that the new thinking was born. It is our burgeoning collective reason that makes us immortal.

The missile division moved through the night past sleeping villages and snow-swept fields, through forests and wooded areas, over frozen lakes and rivers. The heavy column shook the earth and filled the road as it rolled along... It plunged into the silence, into nature. Military nomads on the move among the endless fields and forests, changing location, unbeknown to the enemy. It is futile to search for them from space, to feel for them with radar beams.

Following the column, looking at the red taillights, I inhale the acrid fumes of solar oil...

The new thinking is no romantic ecstasy, it is no exultation, it is no utopian euphoria. Its ingredients are provided and guaranteed by complex ideas, thorough research, and multifaceted approaches. It is verified by calculations and is based not simply on the concept of goodness and humanity but on real notions of economics, sociology, and military strategy. Our army, our military, also participated in its shaping. They, the military, the "defenders," who ever since the war had sweated to safeguard the country's security and create parity, they responded to the new thinking.

It is naive to suppose that such an agonizing, massive task as disarmament can be accomplished without the military, in spite of them, without their ideas and knowledge. For it is they, our military, forced to take up the nuclear challenge, who made the massive effort and sacrifices to create the country's nuclear shield, to design the megamachine of military rivalry, and who know better than anyone its parts and components and the laws governing its functioning. Now they are helping the

leading politicians to dismantle the machine. They are gradually disconnecting the shafts and wheels and disengaging the terminals to prevent contacts from being closed by some careless movement and to prevent an accidental leak of devastating lethal energy.

Only a fool or a malevolent could accuse our military of militarist thinking. Their thinking is defensive. Their contribution to the Washington treaty was no smaller than the contribution of the political leaders, scientists, writers, and futurologists.

I was told that in 1945 this unit was the first to open fire on Berlin with their rocket "Katyushas." In the seventies the regiment's missile launching readiness relieved the pressure on the European part of the USSR from the carrier-borne wings of the United States and its strategic submarines in the Mediterranean and the North Sea. Today the missile unit is preparing to dismantle its divisions, taking down the nuclear awning that covers entire zones of Europe.

I look at the red taillights. At this night hour, a crucial one for the world, I think of our military, the defenders who have honorably carried out their formidable defense task. I salute them!

Toward morning, under the blue moon, partly obscured by clouds, we arrive at the position. The trucks roll into the forest, they squeeze into the tight, creaking, snow-filled emplacements ["stvoly"]... People working through the night, the hum of engines...

We planned our Revolution full of great schemes about changing the ways of the world, people's thinking, the universe. We were in a hurry, we were thirsting to be creative, we had many ideas about domestic life, mechanization, prosperity. We were hoping to turn the postrevolutionary field into a permanent construction site for the development of world and man. What we got instead was the intervention of the Entente, the bloody civil strife, countless revolts, Hitler's onslaught, and the threat of a U.S. nuclear attack, and so much of our creative energy went on building up our defense. "Survival"—that was the inevitable law which supplanted the other laws of development. We put off "till later" our dream of prosperity and set about strengthening our border and building attack aircraft and tanks; we turned the country into a fortified camp, and our thinking, aspiring to the communist ideal, turned to defense.

Under this defensive thinking which ensured our survival there persists the dream of our possible future prosperity. The sense of our history, the connection with our forebears, the faith in the sovereignty of the chosen path, readiness for sacrifice, nationwide fraternity, a sense of duty to the motherland, to our mothers and to our comrades who fell in the struggle—all this is part of our defense ethic, of our defense thinking. It is a store of much human knowledge, skill, discoveries, and material and spiritual accomplishments. The best minds are concentrated in defense. The best forces of the people are in it. Now that our defense is stronger than ever before, and we, surrounded by the powerful military machine of the bourgeois world, are able to defend ourselves, we are embarking on a new era of development. We are beginning slowly and carefully "to extract" from our defense consciousness the precious seeds which it contains and to "transplant" them into a peaceful soil. And they, these seeds, be it science or technology, psychology or ethics, are beginning to sprout.

The restructuring which is our renewal needs these ideals. And they, extracted from the defense sphere, emerging from the "exclusion zones," casting off the secret seals, are taking root in the open life of society and are beginning to serve peaceful development. We will continue this transplantation, while regarding the defense consciousness as a precious legacy. The dismantling of missiles does not mean dismantling the defense consciousness. Let no one pit defense thinking against the new thinking. These two forms of our present-day consciousness coexist in a dialectic relation, feeding each other and linking our socialist sovereignty with the universal idea common to all mankind.

A small turn of the launch key, just a few degrees, but this turn, these few degrees, contain the whole history of life right back to the first living cell which helped to create the biosphere around the planet, engender human reason and thereby create great books, build palaces and cathedrals, unravel the laws of human existence and the universe, and construct these missiles capable of inflicting the final lethal blow to planet earth, capable of turning it back into lifeless, motionless rock. History is a scorpion that turns on itself!

...As I look at the emplacements and the dim reflections of the metal the following thought is going through my mind: Our peacemaking efforts today are focused on this sector where the key might be turned. The treaty signed in the East Room of the White House reduces the probability of this key being turned, it staves off destruction. Reason, passing through the critical point connected with self-destruction, has moved on. It has discovered its infinity. It has begun to build a new, post-crisis existence whose name is nuclear-free world.

No, it will not be "heaven on earth." It will be a world full of rivalry. We will have to defend our ideals, our sovereign socialist choice. However, not by means of a missile attack, not by means of a nuclear explosion which turns the sky crimson. Taking off our nuclear mailed shirt and armor we will be able to breathe deeply and our hearts will be able to beat freely. We, the people who have suffered so much misfortune,

who have shed so much blood and tears, and who have accumulated so much bitter wordly experience, will turn this experience of pain into an experience of unprecedented love, compassion, understanding of human yearning, and genuine, innermost goals of peace. We are a mighty, loving people who know their path, and we face others not over the gun barrel or the missile tip but with sincere minds and hearts.

We know that life holds a resplendent truth for mankind as a whole. And we, our people, will cover our distance toward this truth and, when we have discovered it, we will not keep it to ourselves, but share it with the peoples of the world.

We are now engaged on a vast, difficult cause. We are building a civilization without iron and weapons, a civilization of spirit and accomplishment. In this cause each one of us, be he a diplomat or a military man, a very old man or a baby born last night, is a toiler.

But let us not fall prey to illusions about an immediate, close peace. The stonecrusher of war which is built into the planet rumbles on. Missiles, bombers, and tanks are coming off the production line. Our army, our defense is keeping an alert, untiring watch in all directions. The RSD-10 missilemen will have to mount their alert duty for at least another 3 years after the ink has dried on the treaty.

...I am walking down a rutted track covered with fir branches. I hear the hum of the diesel engines, and the song of the old forest. In the beam of the flashlight I glimpse the face of a young soldier.

Gerasimov Addresses Journalists at Press Centre

Results of Washington Summit

LD171437 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 17 Dec (TASS)—The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington, in our view, means a tranfer to a new stage in relations and to a way out of prolonged confrontation, Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, stated here today addressing a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

The Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and U.S. Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles concluded there, he noted, signifies a practical breakthrough in the nuclear disarmament cause, the foundations for which were laid at the Reykjavik meeting. It should stimulate the achievement of other accords in the disarmament sphere, primarily a 50% reduction in the levels of strategic offensive armaments.

One achievement of the Washington meeting is the setting of limits on the number of warheads on separate types of strategic offensive armaments. An accord has been reached setting a limit of 4,900 units on the total number of ICBM and SLBM warheads within the framework of a total level of 6,000 warhead units. Instructions have been drawn up concerning the limitation of long-range sea-based cruise missiles, thus removing the danger of the circumvention of a future treaty.

All this should happen without strategic stability being disrupted. It is essential to continue observing the ABM treaty, which is a guarantee of such stability, in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

It was agreed to step up the elaboration of an accord on the mandate of the talks at the Vienna CSCE meeting regarding the reduction of conventional armaments. It is appropriate to discuss the question of creating in Central Europe a zone or corridor with restricted armaments, primarily those of an offensive nature. It would be no bad thing to discuss military doctrines, and agreement in principle has been reached on this. It is necessary to complete work on drafting a convention on banning chemical weapons.

As to the question of nuclear weapons' tests, the sides agreed to conduct a joint experiment on monitoring [kontrol] at the test sites of the two sides, the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry stressed. The complete cessation of nuclear tests should be the end result of the talks.

As far as concerns regional problems, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, the key point here should be recognition of the rights of each people to a free choice and the renunciation of any attempts to impose one's own will and ways on others.

We are ready for a broad discussion of the problems of humanitarian cooperation and human rights.

The sides noted the progress made in the development of bilateral contacts, exchanges, and cooperation, but they noted that the present level no longer satisfies the requirements of the present day and is not in accord with the sides' potentials.

It was decided to hold several meetings at ministerial level in order to promote and consolidate the progress achieved during the talks at the summit meeting, the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry noted. The Soviet side confirmed the invitation to the U.S. President to pay an official visit to the USSR in the first half of 1988.

Disputes Carlucci's Remarks

LD171508 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—Speaking at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists today, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, commented on U.S. Defence Secretary Frank Carlucci's statement carried by the Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN.

The newspaper quoted Carlucci as saying that the forthcoming elimination of Soviet medium-range missiles, including those deployed in Asia, did not mean a reduced Soviet military threat in the Asia-Pacific region.

Gerasimov emphasised that it was not the Soviet side that had started the deployment of nuclear weapons in the region and that the Soviet Union was not the leader in that deployment at present.

He cited Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok in which the Soviet leader advanced specific proposals for easing nuclear confrontation in Asia and the Pacific, proposals embracing not only intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, but also other nuclear weapons.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said in the July 1987 interview to the newspaper MERDEKA that the Soviet Union was prepared to eliminate its medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the country, taking into account wishes of Asian countries and their security interests.

"This step by the Soviet side helped to reduce the level of nuclear confrontation in the Asia-Pacific region," Gerasimov said. "Simultaneously, the hope was expressed that the U.S. nuclear presence in that region would not grow."

"The Soviet Union will not increase the number of its aircraft in the country's Asian part if the United States does not deploy in the region additional nuclear weapons reaching Soviet territory," the Soviet Foreign Ministry official said.

Condemns U.S. CW Production

LD171633 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—"The United States is starting the implementation of its program of the production of binary chemical weapons", Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated here today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. "I am not in a position to give an expert opinion of the military aspect of the program. However, its political impact on the process of confidence-building between the Soviet Union and the U.S. can be only negative. By producing binary chemical charges the U.S. is setting a bad example for the countries which do not possess chemical weapons so far and is boosting the process of their proliferation.

"At the same time, in a joint Soviet-American statement adopted at the summit meeting both leaders voiced their allegiance to the working out of a verifiable, all-embracing and effective international convention on banning and eliminating chemical weapons. Today the Soviet side is putting a legitimate question to the U.S. Administration: Isn't the starting of the production of binary chemical weapons at variance with what was stated a week ago in Washington?".

The spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs recalled that the USSR had stopped the production of chemical weapons.

Praises Turkish Stand on INF

LD171514 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS-It was noted with satisfaction in the Soviet Union that the NATO foreign ministers at the recent session of the North Atlantic bloc council came out in support of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told newsmen here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said at a briefing here today that the session's communique pointed out that the treaty paved the way for progress in other aspects of arms control.

Along with the official support for the treaty declared in Brussels, some NATO member countries showed a trend to bypass the agreement, specifically, by adopting so-called compensatory measures directed at building up and modernizing the existing and deploying new types of nuclear weapons not covered by the treaty.

Against the background of such developments, the spokesman said, "one cannot but pay attention to Turkey's constructive stand. Both before and after the conclusion of the treaty, Turkish officials stated in confirmation of Turkey's intention not to assume extra nuclear commitments."

Turkish Defence Minister Zaki Yavuzturk said the other day that his country would not agree, now that the INF treaty had been signed, to the deployment of lance missiles on their territory. "The point at issue are tactical nuclear missiles. Their deployment on Turkish territory has been envisaged by plans of NATO's nuclear modernization.

It has been suggested that the scope and pace of the deployments should be increased within the framework of the 'compensatory measures.'"

In the Soviet Union, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said, the Turkish defence minister's statement announcing the decision to reject the deployment of nuclear weapons in the country was assessed as a concrete manifestation of support for the treaty and demonstration of the Turkish leadership's positive approach to the question of nuclear disarmament.

Soviet Arms to Central America

LD171518 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—"The Soviet side, during the Soviet-American summit in Washington, put forward the idea of both sides considering the possibility of providing practical assistance to a peaceful settlement in Central America," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists that the USSR and the United States could think how to support the steps that were being undertaken by the Contadora Group and by the parties to the Guatemala agreement.

"This mutual accord might include the Soviet Union's and the United States' reciprocal commitments to restrict arms deliveries to Central American countries.

We are supplying weapons to Nicaragua to protect the Sandinista revolution against contra rebels who are being armed by the United States for aggression against that sovereign country.

If the U.S. stops arming the contras, if steps are being undertaken to achieve a peaceful settlement of conflicts in Central America," said the Soviet spokesman, "there will be no need for Soviet arms deliveries to Nicaragua."

ASEAN-CEMA Cooperation

LD171505 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—In the Soviet Union it is believed that the ASEAN members can do a no small contribution to achieving a nuclear-free and non-violent world, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said today.

Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, was speaking at a briefing for Soviet and foreign correspondents.

"In the opinion of the USSR, a noticeable step has been taken at the meeting in the quest for ways of improving the situation, strengthening security in the region and settling conflicts by political means.

"The Soviet Union is not only for developing bilateral relations with the ASEAN countries, but also for looking for forms of cooperation on a collective basis.

"In the USSR it is believed that there are no obstacles to forming contacts between the CMEA (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) and ASEAN," the Soviet spokesman said.

ROK Elections, Rust Case

LD171819 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Another briefing took place today in the USSR Foreign Ministry press center. Gerasimov, head of the ministry's Information Directorate, said that the Soviet Government is sending special representatives to many countries to acquaint leaders with the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington. He also said that a memorial plaque would be unveiled tomorrow on the former building of the People's Commissariate of International Affairs in Moscow, to commemorate People's Commissar Chicherin, an outstanding Soviet diplomat.

As always, many questions were asked at the briefing. For example, Comrade Gerasimov was asked about the attitude in the Soviet Union to the results of the presidential elections in South Korea and how the results might affect Soviet participation in the Olympics. The ministry's representative answered that the elections are a South Korean internal affair, whereas the decision on whether or not the USSR will take part in the Olympics will be made later, closer to the final date determined by the International Olympic Committee.

If my memory does not fail me, several-namely two-questions concerned Rust. There have been press reports, referring to the ministry's Information Directorate, saying that his appeal for pardon was rejected, whereas Rust, as a Western journalist said referring to information at his disposal, has not received any document about this. Comrade Gerasimov answered that the paper is, obviously, on its way between the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the remand section of Lefortovo prison. The second question concerned the issue of whether or not Rust is to be transferred to a camp. Yes, Comrade Gerasimov said, he is to serve his sentence in a prison or camp.

To a question about a possible exchange of New Year's greetings between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan—as I understood it, the question was about exchange of greetings addressed to the U.S. and Soviet peoples respectively—Comrade Gerasimov said he does not exclude this.

Examines UN Gulf Navy Proposal

LD171836 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] [Announcer] Hardly any briefing passes without questions about the Iran-Iraq war, and today's briefing was no exception. In my view, the answer was quite important, and I asked our operators to prepare a recording. Here is what the head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate said.

[Begin Gerasimov recording] We think that Resolution 598 is a good one and that we have not yet exhausted all the possibilities, all the possible efforts aimed at its implemtation. However, we ae prepared to start discussing the so-called second resolution and, at the same time, get down to examining the proposal on setting up a UN navy. The setting up of such forces would promote a political solution of the conflict and would be a further step towards carrying out Security Council Resolution 598. Such UN forces could be also enlisted in the future, probably, for implementing the second resolution which would stipulate the imposition of compulsory measures on the side refusing to comply with the Security Council decision. [end recording]

Previews King Husayn Visit

LD171523 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—King Husayn of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan arrives in Moscow on December 21 at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov announced today.

Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, was speaking at a briefing here for Soviet and foreign correspondents.

He said the talks in Moscow would focus on a Middle East settlement, the issue of convening an international conference on the Middle East, and the need for an end to the Iran-Iraq war.

"In the Soviet Union satisfaction is expressed with Jordan's activities towards a Middle East conference, appreciation voiced for its efforts to rally the Arabs' ranks and the results of the Amman conference are welcomed.

"In Moscow King Husayn is known as the eldest Arab leader, his experience in Middle Eastern affairs is valued, his arrival is expected with content and readiness expressed to exchange opinions with him on a range of issues.

"On most international issues Jordan holds positions which are close to the Soviet Union's and is active in the campaign for peace and disarmament.

"The USSR intends to continue developing economic, trading and cultural relations with Jordan," the Soviet spokesman said.

General Batenin, Experts Hold Media Conference

USSR Position on SDI Unchanged

LD171808 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—The USSR's position in respect of SDI and the militarisation of outer space has not changed after the meeting in Washington. The American side was informed of this at all levels, a press conference was told by General Gheliy Batenin, a military expert of the CPSU Central Committee. The press conference was held by Soviet experts who took part in the Soviet-American talks in Washington.

The main thing that we said was that no weapons should be tested or deployed in outer space, he went on. If this provision is fulfilled by both sides this will exactly mean observance of the ABM Treaty in the way it was signed in 1972.

Whatever is said in the United States about SDI, an evolution of views in the United States on this issue exists and we noticed it, said Vitaliy Zhurkin, deputy director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies. He said that despite the differences in the stands of the USSR and the United States on SDI and ABM some solutions are taking shape in this complex of questions although differences in the official positions of the two sides in questions of militarisation of outer space remain.

U.S. Policy Toward Mideast

LD171739 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1517 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 17 Dec (TASS)—Igor Agabekov and Dmitriy Polunin, TASS correspondents report:

The extension of the 10-year U.S.-Israeli military agreement and Israel's move toward a position of strategic cooperation with the United States, provide evidence that at the talks in Washington the U.S. side gave little heed to the view expressed by the Soviet side regarding the situation in the Near East, said Geliy Batenin, the CPSU Central Committee military expert. He spoke today at the press conference in the NOVOSTI press agency for Soviet and foreign journalists on the theme "The Soviet-U.S. meeting and the Third World." It was held by the Soviet experts who took part in the Soviet-U.S. talks in Washington.

However, General Batenin continued, results do not always appear rapidly in a direct dialogue with such a big and mighty opponent as the United States. The fact that the dialogue has been started and that our view point has not been disproved out of hand—I have in mind first and foremost the stabilization of the situation in the Persian Gulf, because that is where it is most tense—that fact is a positive impulse for continuing the dialogue.

Vitaliy Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute, noted that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States have any right to solve these questions only on a bilateral basis. The principled Soviet position, he said, consists in the fact that the people of each region themselves must solve the fate of their region. This position of the USSR will remain unchanged.

However, that does not mean that the Soviet Union will abandon its attempts to make the United States move toward these proposals, or those Soviet proposals in respect of the Middle East region. Soviet diplomacy has, and will, undertake persistent efforts directed at achieving shifts in the U.S. position toward convening a conference on the Middle East.

It is not only the peoples of the region who need to bring the Iran-Iraq war to an end, Oleg Bykov, deputy chief of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, said. It is also essential to prevent the conflagration from spreading into other countries. Although at the talks in Washington the views of the sides on this issues remained different, there are no blind alleys, he stressed.

The process of searching for a balance of the interests of various sides is being continued.

Settlement of Afghan Problem

LD171744 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—The Afghan leadership-proposed 12-month plan of pulling Soviet troops out of Afghanistan has been accepted by the USSR, and it cannot be otherwise. But the United States' military and financial assistance to Afghan counterrevolutionaries remains a complicating element in settlement of the Afghanistan situation, said General Geliy Batenin, a military expert of the CPSU Central Committee. He spoke here today at a press conference of Soviet experts who participated in the Soviet-American negotiations in Washington.

The solution of the Afghan problem, said General Batenin, no longer depends only on the Governments of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. It depends also on the U.S. Government. It was stated to the American side that the Afghan problem cannot be settled as long as the American side continues its military and financial aid to Afghan counterrevolutionaries, though a fast advance to settlement of the problem could be made already now, the Soviet expert said.

PRC Nuclear Potential

LD171623 Moscow TASS in English 1557 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—Soviet experts who took part in the Soviet-American talks in Washington held a press conference today.

"The question of China's nuclear disarmament in connection with the Soviet-American INF Treaty did not figure directly at the talks in Washington. But the mutual reduction by the USSR and the United States of ten classes of missile systems should, as we see it, serve as a signal also for the other countries possessing nuclear arms, such as Britain, France and, naturally, China", said General Gheliy Batenin, a military expert of the CPSU Central Committee.

"From the military point of view", General Batenin said, "China is a great nuclear power. It has a substantial potential of nuclear arms and the fact that China expresses consent with the policy of nuclear disarmament, which has become a reality with the signing of the INF treaty, is a positive indicator".

Pyadyshev on Assertions Over Nicaraguan Aid

LD161836 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman has described as "being at odds with the reality" the assertions, coming out of U.S. circles, that the Soviet side, during the recent Soviet-American summit, expressed the USSR's readiness to "abstain from giving any military aid to Nicaragua."

Commenting on these assertions in a talk with a TASS correspondent, Boris Pyadyshev said that the Soviet side, during conversations with the U.S. President, reiterated the idea that the USSR and the U.S. agree on a reciprocal basis to review possibilities of promoting the process of peaceful settlement in Central America.

The point at issue was, specifically, support for steps undertaken by the Contadora Group and countries which signed the Guatemala accords.

Such a mutual agreement, the Soviet side emphasized, could include, for instance, the Soviet Union's and the United States' reciprocal commitments to restrict their arms deliveries to Central American countries.

"Firstly, our idea is related to the entire Central American region," Pyadyshev observed. "Secondly, it provides for reciprocal Soviet and American pledges to refrain from deliveries of weapons into the entire region."

The Soviet Union was expecting a response from the American side, said the Foreign Ministry spokesman.

UK Maintains Arms Sales Mission in Iran

LD180523 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] London December 17 TASS—While officially declaring their opposition to arms sales to Iran, the British authorities continue keeping their military mission in Tehran which specializes in trade in arms. This has been admitted, as a matter of fact, by Tim Sainsbury, parliamentary under-secretary of state for defence procurement.

Answering an inquiry, he said that there is a branch of the arms sales company international military service in the Iranian capital. Meanwhile, as the newspaper DAILY TELEGRAPH has established after contacting an official representative of the British Defence Department that the "private" firm is the property of the British Military Department, and in its activities the company follows the government's instructions.

CEMA-EEC Trade Colloquium Opens in Brussels

LD171750 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Brussels December 17 TASS—A representative international colloquium opened today in Gent, Belgium. Its theme is "Political and legal framework of trade relations between EEC and Socialist countries". The colloquium is attended by CMEA Secretary Vyacheslav Sychev, Willy de Clercq, member of the Commission of European Communities in charge of the EEC external relations and trade policy, Umberto Agnelli, vice-president of the Fiat concern of Italy, as well as economists and political scientists from the USSR, the GDR, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, France, Britain, Italy and Belgium.

According to a spokesman for the Commission of European Communities, the colloquium will become a landmark on the way to a further development and consolidation of trade and economic relations between Eastern and Western Europe, between EEC and CMEA.

USSR Criticizes UN Council Vote on Micronesia

LD180510 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 17 TASS—A regular session of the United Nations Trusteeship Council came to a close on Thursday. The session discussed an annual report to the U.N. Security Council on the state of affairs in the trust territory of the Pacific islands (Micronesia) which by a U.N. decision are temporarily administered by the United States.

With the support of Britain and France, the U.S. delegation at the U.N. Trusteeship Council piloted a resolution endorsing the report.

The delegation of the Soviet Union voted against it. "The U.S. side needs sessions of the U.N. Trusteeship Council only for covering up its annexionist actions with regard to Micronesia in order to give them a semblance of legality and international recognition", stated N. Levchenko, representative of the USSR.

"The report was compiled precisely in this key. Everything in it was subordinated to one aim: to justify the administering authority's arbitrary actions with regard to the trust territory, the actions which run counter to the U.N. charter. The administering authority seeks to gobble the trust territory up and to turn into a military-strategic staging area in the Pacific Ocean", the Soviet representative said.

USSR Peace Committee Sets Up Debating Society

LD180345 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] The Peace and Human Rights Debating Society [diskussionnyy klub] has been set up, attached to the Soviet Peace Committee. Its initiators are lawyers, sociologists, writers, and journalists who set for themselves the goal of debating sociopolitical questions, and organizing seminars and debates on topical problems in the fight for peace and human rights.

At the opening of the society, a wide spectrum of questions was discussed, ranging from environmental protection and nuclear disarmament to concrete aspects of civil and criminal law.

United States & Canada

IZVESTIYA Interviews House Speaker Wright

PM171535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Congressman Jim Wright, speaker of the House of Representatives, in Washington 10 December by special correspondents A. Blinov, N. Yefimov, and S. Kondrashov: "J. Wright: The Meeting Has Improved Our Relations"; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Washington—Jim Wright, a congressman from Texas, has been the speaker of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives for a long time. Jim Wright is essentially the main Democratic spokesman on Capitol Hill at a time when there is a Republican President in the White House. The Democratic Party, as you know, now has a majority in both houses of Congress, but relations between the Reagan administration and the U.S. legislative organ are characterized by growing rivalry, mainly with regard to domestic policy.

At the head of a group of leading senators and congressmen, Speaker Wright met with M.S. Gorbachev 9 December during the Soviet leader's visit to Washington. The next day in his office on Capitol Hill the speaker received IZVESTIYA's correspondents and answered our questions.

[IZVESTIYA] Now that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles has been signed, what is your opinion of what took place in Washington? What do you think of the status of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States at the present stage?

[Wright] I believe the Soviet-U.S. meeting which has just ended was the most productive meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States in the last 40 years. It gives us a better opportunity than at any time in the last 70 years for a rapprochement between our countries. I hope that the present treaty is only the first of many steps on arms reduction of a reciprocal and verifiable nature. I personally want this treaty to be followed by a broad and all-embracing reduction of intercontinental ballistic nuclear armaments—which it can be said frighten the peoples—and subsequently a balanced, sensible, mutual reduction of conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals. If this can be done and other steps to improve mutual understanding can also be taken at the same time, then both our states will reduce the disproportionately large amount of their wealth which is now channeled into creating weapons of intimidation and destruction. They will be able to use the resources released for the good of their peoples: building roads, improving work conditions, increasing the production of consumer goods, and expanding the scale of medical research and the fight against various diseases. If we can use just a portion of the means spent on armaments to feed the hungry, clothe the poorly-clothed, and care for the sick, this will be better for the entire human race.

[IZVESTIYA] Mr Speaker, although, not being a senator, you are not directly linked with the process of ratifying the treaty which has been signed, we would like to hear your competent forecast on this score. What are the chances now of the Senate approving the treaty, and how long can the ratification process take?

[Wright] It is proposed that the Senate will embark on the ratification process 19 January and that the hearings on this question will end sometime in March, after which the treaty will be put to the vote. I hope that it will be approved at the beginning of April by an extremely large number of votes.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you have any doubts as to the outcome? Will the treaty be ratified?

[Wright] I seriously believe that the treaty will be approved by the Senate. Yesterday when M.S. Gorbachev met the congressional leadership, the leaders of both Senate party groups expressed their desire to approve the treaty without emasculating its essence. R. Byrd, the leader of the Democratic majority, and R. Dole, leader of the Republican minority, both emphasized this thought. I am convinced that the American people regard this treaty as a step forward in the direction of peace. The overwhelming majority of our citizens approve it. Therefore I think the treaty will be ratified by the Senate.

[IZVESTIYA] But what is your position with regard to the treaty limiting ABM systems?

[Wright] In my opinion, the ABM Treaty is a good example of what can be achieved by our peoples when we cooperate with one another. At the time of its ratification there was overall understanding in the Senate of its terms and its substance. I have frequently informed the White House of this viewpoint, which, in my opinion, is shared by most members of Congress. This is that it is now too late, 15 years after the signing of the treaty, to begin producing new interpretations of its content (which administration representatives are insisting on—IZVESTIYA editorial note). I think that what I have said reflects the wishes of Congress: We believe that trying to give the treaty a new interpretation after so many years serves no useful purpose.

[IZVESTIYA] In other words, you think that both sides—the United States and the USSR—must adhere to the terms of the ABM Treaty?

[Wright] Yes, I do think that. Other legislators in the Senate and the House of Representatives also adhere to this viewpoint. I think that most members of Congress hold this position.

[IZVESTIYA] Does this mean that Congress and the White House hold different positions on this question?

[Wright] Yes, this sometimes happens in a country like ours. We have a long tradition of broad debates and differing viewpoints. Although Congress does try to present a united front with the administration on international questions. We do not want the world to get the impression that our country is falling to pieces because of differences within the political parties. But in the case in question it is not a question of support for party positions, it is a question of an intellectual and juridical interpretation of the existing ABM Treaty. Treaties, like laws, must be observed—we think that the original interpretation was correct and adequate and we do not see the need to change the sense of this treaty after so many years.

[IZVESTIYA] But what do you think about the problem of withdrawal or nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty?

[Wright] The treaty is an existing reality. We are parties to the treaty and the Soviet Union is a party to the treaty, and I think that both sides must continue to observe it. I would like to conclude new treaties which I have already mentioned previously. I believe that in acting honestly and observing former accords we inspire one another to conclude new treaties.

[IZVESTIYA] As you know, the understanding on the U.S. President's visit to Moscow next year has been confirmed at the present summit meeting. What is your prognosis with regard to this visit?

[Wright] In my opinion, M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States has improved relations between our countries. Undoubtedly the American people have formed a very good impression of the Soviet leader. By his words, actions, and behavior he has shown that he has a broad understanding of international affairs. He has demonstrated openness and friendliness, which Americans value highly. I am inclined to think that an individual's traits of character make a greater impression on the American people than the nuances of juridical legislation. Gorbachev passed this test. We see him as a man who looks ahead, who is resolutely fighting for the future and trying to change present institutions so that they match up to this future. We see him as a man who is trying to shake off the fetters of the past and not be guided by former feelings of enmity. We also think that this process must be a two-way street. We want to continue to improve our relations. We are following with interest the processes under way today in the Soviet Union—glasnost and restructuring. In April, as you know, I visited the USSR and visited Moscow and Kiev. You made us feel at home. I don't know if a person could be treated in a more hospitable fashion. The general secretary asked me then whether I would like to address the Soviet people on television.

I very much enjoyed doing this. To conclude my television address I promised to send anyone who wrote me a letter a small souvenir—a badge with a picture of the Soviet and U.S. flags intertwined. I received very many letters, more than 3,000 maybe—from Soviet people of various professions and various ages, and from diverse corners of your vast country. Approximately one-third of all the letters were written in English. The fact that many of your young people have a good knowledge of English made a great impression on me. I don't believe you would find as many young people in America who know Russian. The content of the letters I received also made a great impression on me. For instance, a student from Kalinin—she is 23 years old and a young mother—wrote that your people do not feel hostility toward Americans and want to find out more about them. She wanted to dispel the impression that people of her age in your country have a hostile attitude toward Americans. I received a multitude of drawings from Soviet children. One of them is extremely significant. It depicts a Soviet bomber flying over New York and falling from its bomb bays there are toys, candy, and flowers instead of bombs.

I am confident that ordinary people in your country, like people in our country, want peace. I recall the words spoken by Dostoyevskiy who, you will recall, broke off from working on the novel "The Brothers Karamazov" in order to speak at the celebrations to mark the unveiling of the Pushkin memorial....

Getting up from the table, the speaker of the House went to a bookshelf and, finding the volume he was after, opened it at the desired page. He read in English from Dostoyevskiy: [italicized passage as published]

"...Yes, the destination of the Russian man is indisputably all-European and universal. Becoming a real Russian and becoming fully Russian, perhaps, also means becoming the brother of all people, becoming a universal man if you like.... Our destiny is also universality, not by the sword but by the power of fraternity and our fraternal desire to reunite people." This is a splendid sentiment.

[IZVESTIYA] We have spent 10 days here, read a mass of newspapers, and viewed a multitude of television programs. We have at times had the impression that U.S. journalists covered the talks more from the viewpoint of what concessions the Soviet Union is prepared to make and how the United States will react to this and in what spirit. A question in this connection: What, in your opinion, must the United States itself do in order to improve relations with our country?

[Wright] We must cultivate the sense of a common purpose. We will have to acknowledge that the long years of hostility and isolation have come to an end. We must acquire flexibility of thinking in order to throw off old stereotypes and begin to get to know your country and your people better. In my opinion, a step which would help to improve mutual understanding and progress is

that of increasing the number of Americans who visit your country within the framework of various exchanges, in order to become personally acquainted with life in your country, and also increasing the number of your people who visit the United States.

Ignorance is the enemy of peace, ignorance engenders fear: We fear what we do not understand. There are in our countries malicious people who desire political popularity and who kindle the flames of distrust within the mass of the people on the basis of their own selfish interests. We must stop this and we must educate and enlighten people. I believe that this process is already beginning. I believe that the American people are beginning to turn away from the advice of those who try to strengthen their position by means of icy anticommunism. These people demonstrate their patriotism by showing how much they dislike some other country. But, as A. Stevenson once said, patriotism is not hatred of anything, patriotism is love of something. The enlightened public will have a contemptuous attitude toward those who try to demonstrate their patriotism by showing that they are more Catholic than the pope. This is our hope. The public is ahead of politicians in certain respects. Public opinion polls have clearly shown that most Americans approve of the present treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and most Americans regard what has taken place this week in Washington as a remarkable and correct event. Americans have a very high opinion of what M.S. Gorbachev is doing in your country and what he is trying to do in the international arena.

[IZVESTIYA] What do you expect from the U.S. President's visit to the USSR next year?

[Wright] It is premature now to speak of any concrete expectations. I hope that some additional agreements will be concluded between our countries. I would like there to be accords in the sphere of reducing strategic offensive armaments and conventional armaments.

[IZVESTIYA] One more question, Speaker Wright, about the 1988 presidential elections. In your opinion, what political course will the next U.S. President pursue in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations? Will he be to the left or to the right of R. Reagan?

[Wright] I think that with goodwill and efforts on both sides we will be able to continue the peace process initiated at this time irrespective of who the next U.S. President is. I personally expect the next President to be more moderate and more centrist than Reagan. I don't think Americans want to elect a man who would be as conservative as Reagan is on domestic policy issues. We are now encountering great financial difficulties in the United States which have emerged as a result of the dramatic increase in military expenditure at a time of declining state revenue in accordance with the 1981 tax-cutting law—which primarily benefited the most prosperous of our people. In my opinion this law was a tremendous mistake because, in conjunction with the buildup of military potential, it has led to big deficits for which our grandchildren will have to pay. We have also devoted little attention to the problem of the imbalance in our foreign trade. We must try to improve the quality of goods and our relations with trading partners abroad. We ought, maybe, to expand trade with the Soviet Union. Here at home we must expand opportunities for the education of our children—rich and poor. We must give any young person who wants it the opportunity to obtain higher education. We must create conditions for young American families of modest means to have their own home. We must create the conditions for people to be able to put some of their money aside. It is on these questions that we must concentrate our attention. With this in view, I think that the next president—whether he is a Republican or a Democrat—will be more involved with the problems in question. From the viewpoint of our own interests, the next President will have to understand the need to conclude further agreements with other countries, in particular with the Soviet Union. Agreements which would enable both countries to spend less money on armaments and channel more resources into improving the life of our peoples. This will have to be done irrespective of who the next President is.

[IZVESTIYA] In other words, you need your own restructuring.

[Wright] Yes.

Dole Announces Support for INF Treaty
LD180614 Moscow TASS in English 2226 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 17 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

Robert Dole, Republican minority leader in the Senate, today officially announced his support for the Soviet-U.S. Treaty to Eliminate Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. He made this statement at the White House press room where he made appearance together with President Reagan.

Until the very last moment, Dole, who by virtue of his position will play a major role in the process to ratify the treaty in the U.S. Senate, was refusing to support it alluding to the fact that the text of the agreement was first to be studied. In an obvious bow to the right wing of the Republican Party, where the first in the last eight years Soviet-U.S. agreement in the arms control field was met with protests, Dole even hinted that he could move against the treaty. However, following the conversation with the Soviet leader held during the summit meeting in Washington, the Republicans' leader in the Senate made it clear that he was inclined to support the agreement.

Such maneuvres around the INF Treaty sparked off heavy criticism of Dole who is now seeking the Republican Party's official presidential nomination. As Dole

did not have a definite stance on intermediate-range missiles, support for him in Iowa state, where the election race will officially be launched early next year, support for him has all of a sudden started dwindling, the newspaper WASHINGTON POST wrote.

According to Rich Bond, deputy director of the election campaign of Vice-President George Bush, so far the front-runner among the Republican contenders, the decision by Senator Dole to announce now about his support for the INF Treaty is explained by what he saw as a prospect of defeat in Iowa and now tries to save himself. [sentence as received]

Gus Hall: Treaty 'Symbol of Things To Come'
LD180717 Moscow TASS in English 0703 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 18 TASS—"The signing of the INF agreement is a break in the 40-year nuclear arms race", said Gus Hall, national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States. Commenting in the newspaper PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD on the outcome of the Soviet-American summit meeting, he points out that the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting mean more than the destruction of a whole class of nuclear weapons. It is a "precursor, a symbol of things to come."

The agreement signed at the Soviet-American summit meeting, the article says, signals a start of a new period in humanity's history and makes it possible "to cut long-range missiles in half, to open up trade relations and to establish cultural exchanges and tourism". It has the potential "to finally put an end to the cold war and establish a firm, stable, peaceful coexistence," the American Communist leader emphasised.

Environmental Protection Agreement Signed
LD171129 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] A Soviet U.S. agreement on education and training in the field of environmental protection was signed in Moscow today.

[Correspondent Mr. Baranova—identified by caption] The protocol was signed within the framework of the 1972 program for cooperation in the sphere of the environment. Since 1985, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the U.S. Center for Resources Policy and their leaders, Gennadiy Alekseyevich Yagodin, USSR minister of higher and a secondary specialized education, and Dennis Meadows, the director of the center, have been engaged in drawing up a project for education and training in the sphere of environmental protection.

The first step in the practical implementation of the agreement will be an exchange of specialists and students between Dartmouth College and the state universities of Moscow and Kazan, and also the Moscow Institute of Chemical Technology. It is expected that next year similar projects will be concluded with University of Wisconsin and the University of Ohio.

Kornilov Criticizes Berlin Wall Propaganda
LD171922 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—TASS Political News Analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Deliberating, naturally, in a special way, about the "Berlin Wall" definite circles in the West, particularly in the United States and the FRG, continue rehashing allegations about the "inhuman nature" of some state borders in Europe, try to slander the policy of socialist countries.

One gets the impression that authors of such statements either have no knowledge of or forgotten the essence of the matter. Meanwhile, it is unambiguous. It is known that the division of Germany took place contrary to the arrangements reached in Yalta and Potsdam. Two independent states—the GDR and the FRG, as well as a special political entity—West Berlin, formed in the center of Europe as a result of the war and the post-war development. West Berlin is surrounded by the GDR territory and remains under the occupation regime of three Western powers. In conditions of the situation that existed till August 13, 1961—an open border between the GDR and West Berlin—that city was used as a springboard for subversive work against the socialist German state and its economy, against the Eastern neighbours of the GDR. West Berlin was turned into a seat of tension and became a source of political crises.

Having placed defensive structures on the border with West Berlin, the GDR introduced the controls which usually exist on the borders of any sovereign state. This action was taken fully in accordance with international standards, the measures taken by the GDR eased the situation around West Berlin. They promoted the conclusion by the Governments of the USSR, USA, Great Britain and France of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, which determined the status of the city and emphasized that the Western sectors of Berlin are not part of the FRG, will not be governed by the FRG, and that the ties of the city with West Germany should be maintained and developed precisely with taking into account this provision of the Quadripartite Agreement. That agreement exerted and exerts a stabilizing effect on the situation in the centre of Europe, on East-West relations. It made it possible to improve the external ties of West Berlin, also with the capital of the socialist German state. The USSR also maintains extensive relations with West Berlin.

Such are facts, and they should be taken into consideration by those who on no known grounds would like to deny a sovereign country, the GDR, the lawful right to protect its choice, prevent interference in its internal affairs. By the way, when one reads writings on this subject by certain transoceanic leaders and representatives of the U.S. bourgeois press, one is inclined to ask why is it that those in the USA who so zealously manifest indignation over the construction of frontier "walls" look for the targets for their indignation in Europe? Would it not be easier to turn to the policy of the United States, to consider how matters stand on the U.S.-Mexican border? Three-metre tall metal fences (higher than the Berlin Wall) have been erected there. These fences equipped with electronic signals and [illegible]sion equipment stretch for over 250 km. The w[illegible]ed by large units which every year arrest up [illegible]n "transgressors". Why are these facts overl[illegible] Washington figures who, talking about the '[illegible] as a "symbol of East-West division", prete[illegible] are concerned about nothing else but the in[illegible] of the situation in Europe and are e[illegible] "human rights", namely, man's right to free [illegible]

As far as "walls" and the overall political si[illegible] some or other region go, it would be correct to say that the actual height of frontier barriers depends not so much on the level at which these barriers are placed, as on the level of confidence, mutual understanding, good-neighborliness among states. As to propaganda stereotypes about the "Berlin Wall" existing in the West, they do nothing to strengthen mutual understanding.

Yakovlev Contributes Article to New Journal

LD180452 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 17 TASS—A new quarterly "Nature, Society, and Thought: A Journal of Dialectical and Historical Materialsm" has been started by the Marxist Educational Press Company. The editorial board of the journal issued a press release saying that it will become another channel for the publication of most outstanding works by Marxist scholars, including from the socialist countries. It is also open to progressive scholars who do not necessarily adhere to Marxist views.

The first autumn issue of the journal contains articles on a broad range of issues, including human economic rights in the USA and the constitutional law and practices under socialism, indigenous Americans and the question of nationalities, social, human and structural flaws of sophisticated technology, capitalism, family and juvenile delinquency. These subjects give an idea of the range of the problems dealt with in the journal.

The journal carries an article on moral aspect of perestroyka by Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The editor of the journal is physics Professor Erwin Marquit of University of Minnesota. The editorial board includes such prestigious American scholars as history Professor Herbert Aptheker of University of California, Berkeley, Professor of Political Sciences Michael Parenti of Howard University, philosophy Professor of University of Bridgeport Howard Parsons and others.

The journal is published under University of Minnesota in the city of Minneapolis.

Deaver 'False Testimony' Conviction Reported

LD171531 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 17 TASS—Michael Deaver, former White House deputy chief of staff, a [illegible] friend and confidant of President Reagan, was [illegible] on Wednesday guilty of giving false testimony to [illegible]eral grand jury and U.S. Congress. Deaver was [illegible] with violating the law of ethics in government [illegible]iting lobbying by former civil servicemen.

After retiring from the White House, Deaver used his connections and "assisted" the arms manufacturing corporation Rockwell International in securing contracts for the construction of B-1 bombers. The dealer used his direct contacts with high-ranking figures of the administration to secure lucrative contracts also for the Boeing corporation, hustled contracts for the Governments of Canada, South Korea, Singapore and Saudi Arabia. He was generously paid for his "services".

Now Deaver is threatened with a term of up to 15 years in prison and a fine of 22,000 dollars. The lawyers of Deaver already said they would press ahead for a retrial, and the sum to paid as a fine is simply insignificant. For example, the investigation, the trial in the case and the appointment of a special attorney will cost the American taxpayers more than one million dollars, THE WASHINGTON POST said.

More than 110 high-ranking figures of the administration were accused since Reagan came to power either of violating government ethics or unlawful financial deals. This number does not include the main participants in the Irangate scandal. Among the charges is lie under oath, deception of Congress, unlawful lobbying, abuse of government funds, shady stock market deals and others.

China

PRC To Set Up Sociological Research Service

LD172348 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Beijing December 17 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Mastyukov reports:

Work was launched in the People's Republic of China to set up a state sociological research service in line with the requirements of reforming the country's economic system and political structure. The service will cover all provinces, autonomous regions and cities under the authority of central government bodies. At present, centres of this service have already lauched work in 224 large and medium cities and in 846 rural districts. The overall number of these centres' staffers amounts to 9,700.

The first results of the new service operation are evidence of its dire necessity and importance in formulating and adopting decisions at all levels and on all issues relevant to broad masses of the country's population.

Corrections to Articles on PRC, USSR Reform

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Soviet Journalist Discusses PRC Reforms," published in the 16 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 19:

column two, make subslug read: [Part one of a report on an interview with Vitaliy Korotich, editor in chief of the Soviet journal OGONEK, on his visit to the PRC in the summer of 1987, by unidentified station reporter; date and place not given]... (correcting subslug, clearing editor in chief's name, correcting name of journal)

column two, paragraph one, sentence one: ...recently called on Vitaliy Korotich, editor in chief of OGONEK, a Soviet journal on social and political...(correcting name and title of editor in chief, and name of journal)

column two, paragraph three, sentence one: ...[Korotich] The entire socialist... (correcting name)

The following correction pertains to the article headlined "Part Two of Discussion," published in the 16 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 20:

column two, make subslug read: [Part two of a report on an interview with Vitaliy Korotich, editor in chief of the Soviet journal OGONEK, on his visit to the PRC in the summer of 1987, by unidentified station reporter: date and place not given]... (clearing editor in chief's name, correcting name of journal)

column two, paragraph two, sentence one: ...[Korotich] My impression of... (correcting name)

column two, last paragraph, sentence one: ...[Korotich] We should absolutely...(correcting name)

The following correction pertains to the article headlined "Journalist Notes 'Contradictions' With PRC," published in the 21 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 21:

column one, make subslug read: [Part three of an interview with Vitaliy Korotich, editor in chief of the Soviet journal OGONEK, on his visit to the PRC in the summer of 1987, by unidentified station reporter; date and place not given]... (correcting subslug, clearing editor in chief's name, correcting name of journal)

column one, paragraph two, sentence one: ...[Korotich] Such prospects are...(correcting name)

Northeast Asia

ROK Presidential Elections, Future Viewed

LD172140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Dec 87

[News program presented by Moscow Radio commentator Viktor Levin]

[Text] [Levin] Foreign news agency reports mention South Korea quite a lot. The point is that yesterday the first general, direct presidential elections for the past 16 years took place there. About 90% of registered electors participated in them. Today the results of the ballot were summed up. According to the published data, of the five candidates standing for the post of the head of state, a relative majority was won by the representative of the ruling party, retired General No Tae-u. He came somewhat ahead of his two main competitors put forward by the opposition forces, Kim Yong-sam and Kim Tae-chung. Altogether far more electors voted for the two Kims, as the South Koreans call them, than for the protege of the Seoul regime rulers. I will ask my colleague, commentator Boris Andrianov, to present his opinion on the results of the South Korean elections:

[Andrianov] Judging from reports from Seoul, the leaders of the opposition received the results of the voting bitterly. After all, they had been placing great hopes in yesterday's elections, especially as this direct ballot was taking place on the basis of an altered constitution, and the Seoul authorities had been forced to review the basic law under the strong pressure of the antidictatorial movement that rose in South Korea in this summer. Having then won an important victory, the participants of these mass protests supposed that victory would also accompany them at the elections, the results of which, in the view of the opposition activists, would be a kind of sentencing of the anti-popular Seoul regime, as the majority of the electors would cast their votes against the ruling party's candidate.

[Levin] Strictly speaking that is what has happened: No Tae-u received significantly fewer votes than the opposition candidates.

[Andrianov] As far as the vote totals go, of course, a visible predominance was on the opposition side, which had a real chance of winning had it put forward a single candidate. However, the antidictatorial forces did not manage to enter the election as a united front. Literally on the eve of the opening of the election campaign there was a split in the opposition camp. It was caused by Kim Yong-sam and Kim Tae-chung. Guided by personal ambition and also having come to believe in their own success, each of them decided to stand independently. Furthermore, Kim Tae-chung set up his own Peace and Democracy party and led his supporters away from the Reunification Democratic Party, which was the main force of the major antigovernment union in South Korea—the National Coalition for Democracy.

[Levin] I think that the ruling circles foresaw the probability of that kind of split in the opposition, and quite possibly even staked quite a lot on it in estimating their own candidate's chances in the election.

[Andrianov] I suppose you are not mistaken, Viktor Nikolayevich. But apart from that, Seoul had put into action every available lever in order to ensure the victory of No Tae-u, who is to replace Chon Tu-hwan. The whole of the Seoul regime's administrative system and the military and police apparatus worked actively for that protege of the present South Korean ruler. A powerful propaganda machine, for working upon the inhabitants of South Korea, was made available to him. All civil servants were instructed to vote only for No Tae-u. All servicemen also received an order of that kind. The local authorities received a directive from above, to use any means to force the electors to vote in favor of the ruling party candidate. And on top of all that, during the voting opposition observers unveiled many instances of various machinations at the polling stations. At the moment the South Korean opposition is seething. Kim Tae-chung announced that the elections were unjust and called on the people to come out in support of putting an end to the military regime of Chon Tu-hwan and No Tae-u. It seems very likely that South Korea is on the threshold of serious events.

USSR Official on Coastal Trade With Japan

LD172221 Moscow TASS in English 1211 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yuriy Maksimov:

Such forms of business ties as coastal and cooperative trade have been given a boost in Soviet-Japanese trade and economic cooperation, Mikhail Kiselev, chief of the Department for Trade with the Asian countries of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade said. He heads the Soviet delegation at the ninth meeting of the USSR Foreign Trade Ministry and the Japanese-Soviet Trade Association, which closed on Wednesday here.

At present, Mikhail Kiselev said in a TASS interview, coastal trade is dominated by such staple items as timber, coal and sea foods. At the same time the Soviet Far East has a broad range of locally produced commodities. Both sides, Mikhail Kiselev believes, should work even more purposefully for broadening trade through new products, especially locally produced ones. Without that it is difficult to hope for a further growth of mutual trade.

On the other hand, the Soviet partners in coastal trade show much interest in the purchases of industrial products, especially machinery and equipment which will make it possible to increase the output of export items and improve their quality.

The development of industrial cooperation through the setting up of joint ventures may permit of approaching in a new way the outstanding problems, including the perfection of the coastal trade pattern, Mikhail Kiselev stressed.

The implementation of the long-term state program for the comprehensive development of the productive forces of the Far-Eastern economic area, the Buryat ASSR and the Chita Region up to the year 2000, which has been recently adopted, opens up considerable potentialities for the development of Soviet-Japanese Trade, including the firms—members of the Japanese-Soviet Trade Association.

Near East & South Asia

USSR's Marshal Akhromeyev To Visit India

PM181015 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union S. F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, will pay an official visit to India during the final 10 days of December at the invitation of Chief Air Marshal D. A. Lafontaine, chairman of the Chiefs of Staff and chief of staff of the Indian Air Force.

Petrovskiy Briefs Gandhi on U.S.-USSR Summit

LD172120 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today India's Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi received Comrade Petrovskiy, special representative of the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and

USSR deputy foreign minister, and had a detailed conversation with him. The Soviet representative briefed the prime minister on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. Rajiv Gandhi highly appraised the policies of the Soviet Union, guided by the new thinking, and its contribution to the creation of conditions for taking international relations onto a qualitatively new level. In the course of the meeting, a high assessment was given to the present state and level of Soviet-Indian relations.

DRA Protests Pakistani Firing at Patrol Plane

LD171755 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 17 Dec 87

[text] Kabul December 17 TASS—The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan has made a protest in connection with a new anti-Afghan act of the Pakistani military authorities, the BAKHTAR news agency reports.

It was stated to a charge d'affairs ad interim of Pakistan in Afghanistan that Afghan warplanes making a patrol flight near the populated locality of Towr Kham, Nangarhar Province, on December 10, this year, had been fired upon from the Pakistani territory by anti-aircraft weapons. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan demanded that the Pakistani Administration put an end to such actions aggravating the situation on the border between the two countries.

Morocco's Benaissa Arrives in USSR 15 Dec

LD161348 Rabat MAP in English 1200 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 16 (MAP)—Minister of Cultural Affairs Mohamed Benaissa arrived here Tuesday on a four day official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Benaissa will chair the Moroccan cultural days held in the Soviet Union Dec 14-22.

The cultural event meant to further enhance cooperation between the two countries in cultural affairs is organised by the Moroccan Ministry in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation and the Moroccan-Soviet Friendship Association.

The activity programme includes a wide range of folklore shows and exhibitions of handicraft products and traditional costumes.

Concerts will be given by Moroccan bands and orchestras while Moroccan painters will exhibit their words at the Oriental Arts Museum in Moscow.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopia's Mengistu, Soviet Envoy View Summit

LD172246 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Addis Ababa December 17 TASS—Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia and president of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, received here today special representative of the Soviet Leadership, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department Andrey Urnov.

They held a friendly conversation during which the Ethiopian leader was informed about main results of the Soviet-American summit meeting.

Mengistu Haile Mariam noted the immense importance of the Washington talks for the destinies of mankind. The signing of the INF Treaty, he said, was a first step along the road of real nuclear disarmament and opened up favourable vistas for further advancement towards a nuclear-free world.

The Ethiopian leader conveyed cordial greetings to Mikhail Gorbachev, the CPSU and all Soviet people in connection with this historic achievement.

Meetings were also held between the Soviet representative and Berhanu Bayih, member of the Politburo of the Ethiopian Workers' Party Central Committee and foreign minister of Ethiopia, and Ashagre Yigletu, secretary of the party Central Committee.

Angola's Dos Santos Receives Soviet Envoys

LD180626 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2120 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Luanda, 18 Dec (TASS)—MPLA Labour Party Chairman and President of the People's Republic of Angola, Jose Eduardo Dos Santos, received here the Soviet leadership's special representative USSR roving Ambassador Vyacheslav Ustinov and the USSR ambassador to Angola, Vladimir Kazimirov. The Soviet representatives informed the Angolan president of the results of the summit meeting in Washington between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

ANC's Simon Mokana Opens Mission in Moscow

PM181155 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

["IZVESTIYA Interview" with Simon Mokana, first permanent Moscow representative of South African African National Congress, by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Portanskiy: "ANC Mission Has Opened in Moscow"; date of interview not specified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] An official mission of the African National Congress [ANC]—the mass political organization of the black population of South Africa—has opened in Moscow. Simon Mokana, who recently presented his credentials to Professor M. S. Kapitsa, chairman of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa, has become the first ANC representative in our country.

An IZVESTIYA correspondent conducted an interview with S. Mokana. [passage omitted]

[Portanskiy] The RSA ruling regime tries to distort the purpose of the political struggle in the country. What are the ANC's true aims?

[Mokana] Today it is acknowledged everywhere that apartheid is the source of the violence, the suffering, and the thousands of deaths in the RSA and which is, moreover, responsible for destabilizing the situation in the south of the African Continent. Therefore I would like to stress once again: Our aim is to destroy the apartheid system and not the RSA's white community, as Pretoria's present rulers are trying to say. Various antiracist organizations are operating increasingly vigorously in the RSA, including those set up by whites. The ANC advocates dialogue with the largest possible number of the various groups in our country.

[Portanskiy] How would you describe the importance of international support for your movement?

[Mokana] The oppressed people of South Africa must secure their liberation for themselves. However, there can be no doubt that support for our just cause from all the planet's progressive forces is of tremendous importance and we are interested in seeing it expand.

The Soviet Union has always played an active role in resolving South Africa's problems. Its political and diplomatic efforts in this sphere have increased as the situation in the region has become more complex.

I am sure that the opening of an ANC mission in Moscow will enable us to broaden relations with the Soviet public and to strengthen existing bilateral ties.

Ivanova, CPSU Delegation Arrives in Madagascar

PM171009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation Arrives"]

[Text] Antananarivo, 14 Dec—A CPSU delegation headed by T.G. Ivanova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, arrived in Antananarivo today at the invitation of the Congress Party for Malagasy Independence.

USSR Delegation Returns From Ghana 15 Dec

PM181343 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by P. I. Reznikov, first secretary of the Kamchatka CPSU Obkom, returned to Moscow 15 December from Accra. It was in the Republic of Ghana at the invitation of Ghana's Provisional National Defense Council.

East Europe

CPCZ Replacement of Husak Reported

PM171815 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 87 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under "Abroad" rubric: "CPCZ Central Committee Plenum Opens"]

[Text] Prague, 17 Dec—A plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee started work here today. The plenum considered a request from G. Husak to be relieved of the duties of general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. The request was granted.

The Central Committee gave a high appraisal of G. Husak's activity in the post of general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, expressed thanks to him for many years of fruitful activity at the head of the party, and expressed confidence that he will continue actively employing his experience in the post of president of the CSSR and as a member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and contributing to the successful solution of the tasks of further developing socialism in Czechoslovakia.

The plenum considered an organizational matter. Milos Jakes, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, was unanimously elected general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

The plenum is continuing its work.

More on Husak Replacement

LD171743 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1602 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Prague, 17 Dec (TASS)—A plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee started work here today. The plenum considered the request of Gustav Husak to be released from the duties of CPCZ general secretary. The request was met.

On behalf of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and on his own behalf, Gustav Husak proposed that CPCZ Central Committee Secretary Milos Jakes be elected to the post of CPCZ Central Committee general secretary. He was elected unanimously as general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

Milos Jakes expressed gratitude for the high degree of trust placed in him and assured the Central Committee that he will do everything possible so that the CPCZ successfully fulfills the tasks with which it is confronted by the modern era. He also thanked Gustav Husak for the great work he has done at the head of the party Central Committee for 18 years. The program of the 17th congress, Jakes said, which will be further developed at the current plenum, will continue to remain the main directive in our work. This realistic and truly humane program is directed toward the implementation of the fundamental aims of the party, all-round development of the individual and his creative abilities, raising the material and spiritual standards in people's lives, ensuring social justice and civil rights and freedoms, Jakes said.

The plenum adopted a resolution to the effect that Czechoslovakia's Communists highly value the activities of Gustav Husak as general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

Husak was one of the leaders of the Slovak national uprising and remained a principled Communist, not losing faith in the ideals of socialism at a time when he became a victim of crude violation of socialist legality. His courage and loyalty to the cause of the working class and the Czechoslovak people and his profound devotion to the Soviet Union were demonstrated during the period of crisis in 1968-69. The election of Gustav Husak to the supreme leading post in the party in April 1969 was a manifestation of the respect and trust that he had won among the Czechoslovak Communists and all the people as a revolutionary, patriot, and consistent internationalist. Overcoming the crisis period and making a decisive move to strengthening the ideological and organizational unity of the party and its Leninist nature are connected with Husak's activities in the supreme party leadership. A process of consolidation in the party and in society took place successfully, Lenin's concept of the equal rights of peoples and ethnic groups was ensured in the CSSR, and the true values of socialism were restored in Czechoslovakia under his leadership, the resolution stresses.

The plenum expressed confidence that Gustav Husak will continue to make active use of his experience in the post of president of the CSSR and member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium.

On the plenum agenda is discussion of the report of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium, "For Consistent Implementation of the Line of the 17th CPCZ Congress Toward Acceleration of Economic and Social Development, Comprehensive Restructuring, and the Deepening of Socialist Democracy," which will be delivered by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

The plenum continues its work.

Gorbachev Congratulates Jakes

LD171503 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev cordially congratulated Milos Jakes on the occasion of his election general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

"We are confident," said a telegram of congratulations from the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "that the Central Committee under your leadership will ensure the fulfilment of wide-scale tasks facing the party in the field of the further development and renewal of socialism on Czechoslovak soil, the restructuring of the economic mechanism, the democratization of the public and political life of the country and the implementation of the decisions passed by the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia with the aim of accelerating the social and economic development of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic."

Mikhail Gorbachev wished Milos Jakes every success in his new and important post.

PRAVDA on Conclusion of RCP National Conference

PM171209 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by PRAVDA and TASS correspondents S. Petukhov and O. Shirokov: "RCP National Conference"]

[Text] Bucharest, 16 Dec—After concluding the debate, the RCP national conference today unanimously approved the report presented by N. Ceausescu, the party's general secretary, and the Central Committee's activity in implementing the 13th RCP Congress decisions. A number of documents and a resolution were adopted.

The basic tasks of socialist building at the present stage formulated in the report were discussed for 3 days at the plenary sessions and in the sections, and specific measures were outlined to successfully fulfill the 5-year plan targets and accelerate the country's development. Approximately 300 delegates spoke.

Definite successes have been achieved in fulfilling the 5-year plan target during the first 2 years of the current 5-year plan, C. Dascalescu, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and prime minister of the government, pointed out. The economy's material, technical, and power base is expanding and being modernized, the level of mechanization and automation of production processes is rising, and production of high-technology types of output is being started up. At the same time, the speaker said, during this period serious shortcomings and omissions have manifested

themselves which have had an adverse impact on production of the planned output—above all that earmarked for export—on the commissioning of new projects, and on the growth of economic efficiency as a whole. These malfunctions have been manifested particularly in the extracting industry, power generation, and also certain manufacturing sectors of industry. This state of affairs, the speaker pointed out, must not be viewed in isolation from the activity of the government and the leadership of ministries and industrial associations which have not been sufficiently firm in ensuring the timely fulfillment of the plan outlines for making full use of the country's machine pool, labor reserves, and work time or in strengthening order and discipline at every work place.

New power stations have been commissioned in the republic this year with a total capacity of 1,200 megawatts instead of the planned 1,600 megawatts. Construction of the first Romanian nuclear power station and of a number of other thermal and hydroelectric power stations is being completed. However, the plan for construction of coal-fired stations has not been fulfilled. Romanian Agriculture Minister G. David pointed out that, despite a certain growth in the yields of grain and other crops, output in crop production and livestock raising is still below the planned level.

Emissaries from many judets said that special programs have recently been adopted everywhere for the modernization and scientific organization of production, and new financial and economic normatives have been set with a view to ensuring the firm application of the principles of self-management and economic accountability [khozraschet]. The delegates pointed to the need to persistently enhance the quality of the work of RCP judet organizations and all party organs and to wage a resolute struggle against manifestations of tolerance of shortcomings, formalism, red tape, and suppression of criticism.

The documents adopted by the conference point out that the fulfillment of the 5-year plan's large-scale targets under conditions of all possible economies in material, power, and labor resources, the consistent improvement of output quality, and the broad modernization of the national economy's technical base must be guaranteed through efficient organizational work by the party and by state organs, through rational management in all spheres, and by limiting consumption to the level of the actual potential. Special emphasis was placed on the importance of commissioning all available reserves and resources, stepping up the export effort with a view to eliminating the foreign debt as quickly as possible, improving management and planning, and activating political-ideological and cultural-educational work among the masses.

The conference decisions define specific areas and rates for further developing the national economy in the current 5-year plan and for the harmonious development of the country's judets.

At the concluding session, N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP, declared that Romanian Communists are fully resolved to do everything possible to implement the plans for the Republic's socioeconomic development adopted by the 13th party congress.

Hungarian Unemployment Solutions Outlined

PM161341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Gerasimov: "They Have Gone Bankrupt, What Next? The Struggle Against Enterprises' Losses Is Continuing in Hungary"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpts] After the report from Hungary under the heading "Bankruptcy Case" (PRAVDA 20 July) the editorial office received many letters whose authors asked for details and explanations: How is the process of getting rid of unprofitable enterprises developing in the country? Where are workers finding jobs in these cases, and is their right to work—one of the fundamental gains of socialism—not infringed? We return to this theme again today.

Budapest, December—[passage omitted] In Hungary exactly a year ago, a cleaning up organization appeared designed to implement normalization measures in the economy. A law on bankruptcy and the procedure for putting loss-making enterprises into liquidation was adopted.

This new organization was situated in the administrative bloc of a former "monopolist"—the "Elzett" metal articles combine. Some 2 years ago, it was "split" into five independent plants. The market situation recently forced one of them into liquidation; it merged with another that was managing successfully. It was symbolic in its way: The "doctors of industry" were settled in a building which... had been sold by auction.

"In the course of the year, we have dealt with nine insolvent enterprises," Laszlo Redei [director of the "cleaning up organization"] says. "There are just 15 of us here, but other specialists are recruited under contract. The Hungarian Ministry of Finance has given us a 2 billion-forint fund for eliminating loss-making. How has the cleaning up been organized? Here, for instance, is the bankruptcy case of the Veszprem construction enterprise. Its creditors—the Hungarian credit bank and 12 large enterprises—were the initiators. Within the 30 days stipulated by law, the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce (as of 1 January it will be called the economic chamber) tried to reach a compromise between creditors and debtor. That did not succeed. The papers came to us. We also have 30 days to decide whether to render aid to an enterprise which has "gone broke" or to admit that there was no way out except to sell the enterprise's assets through the financial organs."

"From what criteria does the cleaning up organization proceed here?"

"There are three criteria," my interlocutor replies. "First we make a study to determine whether the closure of the enterprise will cause serious employment problems in a given region. Then we look at whether fulfillment of international commitments, of orders from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, will be threatened if the enterprise is closed. Third, we study whether this will impede production of defense equipment."

An analysis of the activity of the construction enterprise showed it had been working at a loss for many years. Its problems were aggravated when all the country's construction organizations moved to the competitive system of taking orders: The one which offers to fulfill them most cheaply, rapidly, and to the highest standard wins. The situation was hopeless when even its own Veszprem county council gave the building of a number of establishments to "foreign" contractors. The cleaning up organization also studied the district's employment capacities: They were sufficient. As a result, the creditors received support. The property of the Veszprem enterprise is now being sold off. The orders it has failed to fulfill have been passed on to other economic organizations. But what about the workers?

Of course, the liquidation did not proceed without conflicts. The Veszprem district committee created a special coordination commission uniting council and trade union workers which concerned itself with finding work. I talked with its chairman, Ferenc Berei (he is a secretary of the MSZMP county committee).

"Of the 2,351 construction workers 537 remained at their old work places," Berei says. "Some 1,393 went to other enterprises managing their economic affairs successfully, and 262 became founders or members of various small cooperatives and partnerships for rendering services to the population."

Those left without work are also being found employment.

A repair plant in Balassagyarmat was recently put into liquidation at the demand of its creditors. There it was a question of the fate of a few hundred people, so no special employment problems arose. Commissars of the cleaning up organization have now been appointed at five insolvent plants, to which various aid is being given. Thus the Budapest mechanical foundry named for A. Gabor (450 workers and employees) received a number of valuable consultations in compliance with which one loss-making shop has been stopped and the workforce has been regrouped. The "Lang" machine building plant was given funds for restructuring its production structure from the above-mentioned fund for eliminating loss-making.

A particularly important aspect of the cleaning up process is that the production facilities and manpower should operate with greater social effectiveness under the new conditions. But cleaning up must be carried out while observing humaneness, under conditions of the strict consideration of socialist principles. This was also emphasized in the program for emerging from difficulties adopted this fall by the Hungarian National Assembly.

The right to work and effective economic management are concepts by no means on different sides of the barricade, although people in Hungary believe that ensuring full employment is a task not for enterprises but for the state. Organizations engaged in economic matters place emphasis on the economical and expedient use of manpower resources. Those workers who have several specialities and agree when necessary to be retrained, who display initiative and rationalizing abilities, are increasingly valued. The prestige of the worker's place and of the good foreman has increased.

Employment bureaus are now functioning in every county of Hungary and in the big cities. Those workers of bankrupt enterprises who have not yet found work receive where necessary an allowance for a year: for the first 6 months, 100% of their average wage; for the next 3 months, 75%, and for the final months, 65%. Various retraining courses have been opened.

"For instance, right now lathe and other machine tool operators, nurses, and food store sales clerks are very much in demand," Jozsef Rozsa, chief of the State Office for Wages and Labor main department for the management of manpower, tells me. "At the same time, there is a surplus of administrators and textile and sewn goods industry workers. There are about 60,000 vacant jobs in the country at present."

"How many people are seeking work?

"10,000 people."

In citing these figures, J. Rozsa specifies:

"Of all those seeking work 2,000 have been unemployed for several months. There are various reasons. One of them is that enterprises refuse to take on those who have left their jobs two or three times in a year, and they do not take absentees, violators of labor discipline, and heavy drinkers. It has also become difficult to find work if your qualifications are poor.

To solve these rather painful problems, the local councils have expanded socially useful work: road repair and construction, park keeping, municipal services, snow and garbage clearing. Some 70% of expenses on these operations are met from a central source: a specially created employment fund (it contains 1.8 billion forints) while 30% is covered by the local councils' budget. The employment fund also provides money for maintaining

those efficient enterprises which are opening new work places and extending courses for workers' retraining. This fund also pays employment allowances and "premature" pensions. Incidentally, early retirement when enterprises are broken up or reorganized is allowed no more than 5 years before retirement age, with an employment record of 30 years for men and 25 years for women. For instance, 500 people were retired early on pension in Ozd City, where there was a cutback of nearly 3,000 people at the loss-making metallurgical plant, J. Rozsa told me. Retraining courses were organized for 700 people. The remainder were mainly found jobs.

I was told that in the next few years 2,000 new jobs will be created in Ozd, partly from the employment fund. Nearby enterprises are being offered the chance to construct new shops and open new branches in Ozd on favorable terms, with the granting of credit.

The employment problems which have arisen in Veszprem and Ozd have been a useful lesson: The party and public organizations have learned a lot. Permanent regional forums for coordinating working people's interests and coordination commissions have started to operate. There is a growing understanding of the fact that enterprises must inform each other better of their proposed reductions, my interlocutors noted.

Preventing possible difficulties promptly and calculating in good time each step in restructuring the structure of industry, realizing that the methods for finding employment for the workers of enterprises put into liquidation are becoming an important economic, social, and political factor—that is what the economic leaders are being urged to do by the party and public organizations. The MSZMP Central Committee is unambiguously and most resolutely opposed to unemployment and in no way considers it a means of raising labor discipline or overcoming economic unprofitability. The state assumes responsibility for full and rational employment, seeking to ensure that each person works where he is really needed.

West Europe

Shultz Briefs Britain's Thatcher on INF Treaty

LD171139 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] London December 16 TASS—TASS correspondent Yuriy Levchenko reports:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, staying here, held talks with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Geoffrey Howe. The visit to London was the last lap in George Shultz's tour of a number of West European countries to set out to the United States' allies the details of the recent Soviet-American summit in Washington.

Speaking at a news conference at the United States Embassy in London, George Shultz expressed gratitude to the British Government for its role in the achievement of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, which was signed at the Washington summit. At the same time, Shultz repeated the NATO propaganda thesis that it is allegedly only due to the implementation of the 1979 NATO decision on the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles and "Pershing-2" missiles in Western Europe that the signing of the agreement has become possible. He noted that in West European capitals he found support for the INF Treaty.

George Shultz expressed the hope that during the meeting between General secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan in Moscow next year it will be possible to achieve progress on the road to banning nuclear weapon tests.

In answer to the request to express his view on the possibility of the development of a joint Franco-British cruise missile, George Shultz said that he had not discussed this question at the meeting with the prime minister. At the same time, he said there existed the opinion that work should be continued on weapons that Britain has in order to modernize them. He said he was not surprised that work on missiles of this kind continued.

Britain Offers To Accept More U.S. Jets

LD172248 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] London December 17 TASS—The British Government has offered the use of its Air Force bases by extra squadrons of U.S. fighter-bombers once cruise missiles are removed from British soil in compliance with the Soviet-American treaty scrapping intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. This sensational fact was reported by the British newspaper INDEPENDENT today.

Quoting a Pentagon source, the paper emphasized that "of all the European allies, it is Britain that has been expressing the most interest" in deploying an increased number of planes on its territory.

New potential homes for extra squadrons of F-111 fighter-bombers and their replacements, F-15E Strike Eagles, are the Greenham Common base, where U.S. cruise missiles are currently deployed, and the support base at Alconbury.

The paper noted that F-15Es will be operational by 1992—the time the last of cruise missiles is due to be dismantled. The new planes are capable of deliverying available types of nuclear weapons and a new top-secret conventional cruise missile now being developed by the U.S. Air Force.

The new missile is known by its full name of Joint Tactical Missile System (JTMS). It is a weapon with a big explosive warhead to be used against enemy supply depots, headquarters bunkers and communications centers.

The paper speculated that the missile's guidance system might be similar to the Stealth bomber that has secret methods of evading enemy radar.

It is plain from the report that British and U.S. military planners, keenly aware of the sentiment evoked by the signing of the INF Treaty, hope to 'sell' the British public the idea of stationing new JTMS-armed fighter-bombers on British soil under the pretext that it is a conventional, as opposed to a nuclear package.

The F-15E would still be able to carry nuclear weapons if required, INDEPENDENT observed in conclusion.

Confidence Vote for Chirac Government Assessed

PM171435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Bolshakov Commentator's Column: "Operation 'Vote of Confidence'"]

[Text] Paris—For the third time since coming to power in March last year, Prime Minister J. Chirac of France has asked parliament for a vote of confidence in the government. As before, both chambers of parliament, where the ruling right-wing parties have a majority, confirmed the government's mandate.

The latest "vote of confidence" operation was conducted against the background of a series of events that seriously tested the durability of the government's policy. For example, as a result of the stock market collapse, the program of denationalization of state enterprises hastily implemented by the Chirac cabinet has ruined small and medium investors. This hit that very section of the electorate which opted for the right, believing in the myth of "popular capitalism."

The successful outcome of the talks between the USSR and the United States on elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, which culminated in the signing of the corresponding treaty during the Washington summit, has caused the criticism of the government's militarization program to intensify. As Deputy M. Gremetz, member of the Politburo and secretary of the French Communist Party Central Committee, stated to the National Assembly's foreign affairs committee recently, France is going against the tide of history by building up its armaments and initiating the creation of a NATO "European bulwark" by pooling the European countries' nuclear and other armaments.

Nor has the government's popularity been increased by the recent story involving the release of two French hostages in Lebanon. This raised quite a few questions not only in France but also abroad. The government is being criticized for entering into dubious deals during talks with terrorists and with the Iranian Government. There are reports of some kind of "ransom" and that the recent expulsion of a number of members of the Iranian opposition from France was also part of the "payment" for the hostages' release.

Furthermore, criticism is being leveled at the government not only from the ranks of the left-wing parties but also from within the right-wing majority. The recent criticism of Chirac's policy by R. Barre, an ally in the right-wing bloc and a presidential candidate, was particularly harmful to the prime minister. Thus a far from unimportant task of "operation vote of confidence" was to force all right-wing party deputies to vote in support of the government's policy and thereby avert a pre-election controversy, for a time at least.

Once again the government has obtained the right to govern from parliament. This is being viewed as a serious claim by Chirac to take part in the approaching presidential election and a significant confirmation of his leading role within the right-wing bloc. At the same time, the parliamentary debates have shown that dissatisfaction at the government's policy in the country is increasing. It is no coincidence that the government has again secured from parliament a supply of indulgences in the form of the vote of "confidence."

Karpov Meets French President, Other Officials

LD181203 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Paris, 18 Dec (TASS)—French President Francois Mitterrand has received Viktor Karpov, member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, chief of the Directorate on Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament, who is in Paris and who informed the president on instructions from M.S. Gorbachev of the results of the summit meeting in Washington.

Meetings and conversations were also held with Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond, in the offices of Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, in the Senate, and in the French National Assembly. V. Karpov had a conversation with Charles Goerens, president of the Assembly of the West European Union.

Yakov Ryabov, USSR ambassador to France, took part in the conversations.

FRG Defense Minister Cited on NATO Activities

LD172340 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1412 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] London, 17 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Yuriy Levchenko reports:

The militarist circles in the West are obviously alarmed at the tempo of nuclear disarmament which was set by the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which was signed in Washington. They are bent on slowing down this process using all kinds of pretexts. Heavily indicative of this are the pronouncments by FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner, who next summer will replace the retiring Lord Carrington as NATO general secretary.

In an interview with the FINANCIAL TIMES, this Bonn hawk, well-known for his close ties with the FRG military-industrial complex, did not hide the fact that he is not happy with the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles. He says, it "does not strengthen, but weakens the FRG's security". He spoke out against further steps toward reducing nuclear arsenals, in particular theater nuclear weapons in Europe, under the pretext that this would somehow make Western Europe vulnerable in the face of "Soviet supremacy in the field of conventional armaments and armed forces." One gets the impression that he knows nothing about the Warsaw Treaty's readiness to hold talks on a whole complex of armaments, including conventional ones, with the purpose of levelling them out and reducing them. For that reason, he insisted on NATO's "right" to modernize its tactical nuclear weapons and to strengthen the alliance's conventional armed forces and armaments. "Many people think that because we have achieved success in one sector of disarmament, it is then possible to give up all our defensive efforts," he claimed. "I want to let you know now that this is not the case. If this happens, then the Soviet Union will obtain an advantage which will enable them to dominate Europe."

Woerner tried to justify the Franco-West German military cooperation, which he has been actively striving for in recent years. This cooperation was expressed in the recent decision to create a joint Franco-West German brigade, as well as certain military coordinated bodies. "The Brigade," he said, "is not being created for parades. It will be given a specific military task. We view its creation as the first step to be followed by others."

Woerner's Hawkish views are well known to the NATO leaders. At the start of the eighties, he played a leading role in pushing through the decision to deploy the U.S. "Pershings" and cruise missiles in the FRG, which are now due to be eliminated as a result of the Soviet-U.S. agreement. He came out vigorously against the "double zero" concept which lay at the basis of this agreement. According to the FINANCIAL TIMES, his stand on this "ensured for him a friendly attitude on the part of the NATO generals and the reputation of a champion of the 'cold war' in left-wing circles."

Woerner made it clear that in the time remaining until the summer, he is going to use his position as defense minister to achieve a further considerable increase in the FRG's military expenditure and programs.

Soviets Brief Europeans on Summit Results

Swedish Politicians Informed

LD172133 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Stockholm, 17 Dec (TASS)—V.P. Starodubov, section chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and N.N. Uspenskiy, chief of the Second European Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who arrived in Sweden today as special representatives of the Soviet leadership, met with Lena Hjelm Wallen, acting Swedish foreign minister and minister of foreign aid. They also met with representatives of the Social-Democratic Labor Party leadership, Gunnar Stenarv, the secretary of this party on international affairs, and Sture Eriksson, chairman of the interparliamentary group of the Riksdag.

The Soviet diplomats informed the representatives of Sweden about the results of the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States.

L. H.-Wallen and the representatives of the Social-Democratic Labor Party gave high appraisal of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed during the meeting, noting that this document is an historic agreement, as a result of which one of the more effective classes of weapons existing at present is to be eliminated. On behalf of the people of Sweden, they expressed hope for a continuation of the constructive dialogue between the USSR and the United States in the interests of attaining the ultimate goal—complete elimination of the entire nuclear arsenal on earth. Taking part in the conversations was the USSR ambassador to Sweden, B.D. Pankin.

Belgium's Tindemans Briefed

LD180725 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Brussels, 17 Dec. (TASS)—N.N. Afanasyevskiy, special Soviet representative, had a conversation here today with L. Tindemans, Belgian minister of foreign relations, and Foreign Ministry executives. On the instructions of the Soviet leadership, during the conversation, he briefed them on the results of the visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States.

The Belgian side gave a high evaluation of the impressive results of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Washington, especially of the agreement to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles.

N.S. Afanasyevskiy arrived here from Luxembourg, where he had been on an identical mission. There he was received by Vice Prime Minister, J. Poos, the minister of foreign affairs, who called the Soviet-U.S. agreement a historic one and supported its earliest implementation.

Meeting With Italy's Cossiga

LD172306 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Rome December 17 TASS—Italian President Francesco Cossiga today received special representative of the Soviet leadership, Ambassador at Large Oleg Grinevskiy and Soviet ambassador to Italy Nikolay Lunkov.

The Soviet officials informed the Italian head of state about the results of the Soviet-American summit talks.

Cossiga described the results of the Soviet-American summit and the signing of the INF Treaty as a "truly historic event."

A qualitative step had been made towards a new state of international relations, the Italian president observed. Mankind was about to witness a major turn in world politics, he added.

Cossiga conveyed to Mikhail Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders greetings and wishes of success in implementing domestic and foreign policy.

Talks With Turkey's Halefoglu

LD172129 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Ankara, 17 Dec (TASS)—Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs V. Halefoglu today received N.N. Rodionov, special representative of the Soviet leadership, who arrived in Turkey today to expound to the Turkish leadership the Soviet point of view on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington and prospects for developing the process of general disarmament.

V. Halefoglu noted that the treaty signed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and R. Reagan, President of the United States, which is appraised as historic, was met with satisfaction in the Turkish Republic. Turkey is convinced that a most speedy ratification of this treaty will make a contribution to the cause of strengthening peace overall, the minister stressed.

Greek Prime Minister Briefed

LD172220 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Athens December 17 TASS—Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou today received USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vadim Loginov who arrived here. The Soviet diplomat also had a meeting with Greek Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias.

The Soviet diplomat informed the Greek leadership in detail about the Soviet-American summit that was held on December 7-11 in Washington.

Andreas Papandreou expressed gratitude to the Soviet leadership for detailed information. The prime minister spoke highly of the Soviet-American agreement, noting special contribution of the USSR and its constant efforts to achieve goals for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Andreas Papandreou said that Greece as a participant in the initiative of the six will be exerting constant efforts to promote the achievement of an agreement of a 50-per cent cut in nuclear strategic arms which is now in the order of the day.

U.S. Bases in Turkey, Mediterranean Discussed

TA171621 Moscow Radio in Turkish to Turkey 1830 GMT 11 Dec 87

[Unattributed commentary: "The U.S. Bases Policy and Turkey"]

[Text] The situation in the Mediterranean is one of the topics being discussed at the NATO winter meetings held in Brussels. As stated by the FINANCIAL TIMES, this is considered natural since the dissatisfaction over the existence of U.S. bases in southern Europe is steadily increasing.

Washington obtained Ankara's consent to the extension of the Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement with difficulty. As soon as it consolidated its achievements in Turkey, however, Washington's relations with Spain become strained. One of Madrid's demands is that the United States withdraw 72 F-16 bombers from the [name indistinct] U.S. airbase. It would be apt to note here that troops and war machinery participating in military maneuvers were being transported from this base to eastern Anatolia via an air bridge.

Following Madrid, Athens also renewed its request to dismantle the U.S. bases on its territory. According to commentators, the evacuation of the 24 U.S. military installations in Greece would be an immeasurably greater loss for the Pentagon than the evacuation of its bases in the Iberian Peninsula, because the U.S. military installations in Greece are very close to the oil fields in the Near and Middle East, as well as to the southwestern flank of the Warsaw Pact.

The United States resorted to every possible method to pressure the Greek Government, including accusing it of conducting relations with terrorists, threatening to reduce U.S. aid, and fanning Greek-Turkish conflicts. The Greek leader declared, however, that the Mediterranean belongs only to the people living in the Mediterranean and these people want neither the U.S. fleet, nor any other fleet and bases in their region.

According to commentators, under these circumstances, one must expect the United States to renew its pressure on Turkey. As stated in the report of the U.S. Heritage Foundation official, James Phillips, Turkey is assuming a greater strategic importance to the United States. As the press has also noted, Turkey's importance and role is increasing with the signing of the INF Treaty.

A long time ago, the Pentagon planned to deploy advanced nuclear weapons for the sea and air in European countries; Turkey is one of these countries. According to MILLIYET, from the viewpoint of nuclear stocks on their territory, Turkey occupies fourth place among NATO's European members. There are some 200 nuclear bombs in the Incirlik Airbase. The U.S. F-16 planes that can carry these bombs are being deployed on this base. Also according to MILLIYET, 30 advanced nuclear security systems are being built on Incirlik Base in line with a Pentagon decision last year. The BALTIMORE SUN writes that Turkey, which houses a greater quantity of NATO and U.S. military installations than necessary on its territory, is faced with the danger of being transformed into the largest ammunition depot in the Mediterranean region.

This is contrary to the spirit of current times as well as to Turkey's interests. Furthermore, it does not contribute to the strengthening of peace or to the cause of disarmament.

Significance of INF Agreement to Turkey Viewed

TA171454 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1830 GMT 11 Dec 87

[Aleksey Zlatorunskiy commentary: "The INF Agreement and Turkey"]

[Text] According to reports reaching Moscow Radio, the INF agreement signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Washington was received positively among Turkish social circles. Articles appearing in CUMHURIYET, GUNAYDIN, the TURKISH DAILY NEWS, and other newspapers demonstrate this well. For example, the TURKISH DAILY NEWS noted: We hope that the Washington summit meeting will assist in the consolidation of world peace and constitute a starting point for the signing of a series of new and wide-ranging agreements.

Dear listeners, we would like to dwell on this statement. The significance of the Soviet-U.S. agreement is great. This agreement has dug a hole in the nuclear arms race system. Most importantly, the INF agreement has provided opportunities for solving several international political and economic problems, including problems important to Turkey.

If the ghost of suspicion used in recent years to transform Turkey into a warning post for NATO is eliminated for good, will the Turkish people not breathe more easily? Will they not view the future with greater security? The Turkish people paid a high price for the transformation of the country into a warning post for NATO. A few generations raised after World War II were forced to tighten their belts further or emigrate to other countries in the hope of finding employment, all in the name of maintaining a large army and allocating enormous funds to purchase modern weapons. Imagine, dear listeners, how the socioeconomic situation of every country could change if the billions of dollars spent to feed the arms race could be channeled into causes that benefit the country.

During its 42d session, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution for establishing a comprehensive international peace and security system. We are not about to conceal the fact that implementing this resolution will not be easy, but the first step has been taken. This is the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The agreement covers only 4% of the total nuclear stocks in the world. We would, however, like to rely on our common sense and believe that this is only a beginning. It shows the right direction for new steps, which all countries favor regardless of their geographical location.

Briefs

Taxation Agreement With Belgium

Brussels December 17 TASS—An agreement between the USSR and Belgium on the removal of double taxation was signed today in the premises of the Foreign Ministry of Blegium. On behalf of Belgium it was signed by Leo Tindemans, minister of external relations of the country, and on behalf of the USSR—by Felix Bogdanov, ambassador of the USSR to Belgium. [Text] [*Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 17 Dec 87 LD*]

Political & Social

Politburo Approves INF Treaty; Hears Zaykov

LD172117 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. At a meeting which took place on 17 December, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considered the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. The Politburo completely approved the work carried out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his official visit to the United States. The signing in Washington of the Treaty between the USSR and the United States On the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles is an important landmark in international development. A practical start has been made in constructing a world without nuclear weapons. This treaty is historic in so far as it deals for the first time with the real destruction of two classes of nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States. The most stringent verification measures envisaged by the Treaty reliably ensure the monitoring of its implementation by both sides. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty corresponds to the interests of all peoples and increases the level of security on a global scale.

As a result of persistent and purposeful efforts, there was success in achieving a significant advance on the problem of a radical reduction in strategic offensive weapons under conditions of observing the ABM Treaty. This problem remains central in Soviet-U.S. relations, and the USSR is working on the assumption that the task of preparing an appropriate treaty for signing in Moscow during the return visit by the U.S. President to the USSR in the first half of 1988 is a realistic one.

During the talks, the mutual intention to facilitate the development of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations and to establish a frank and constructive dialogue on humanitarian problems was expressed. Despite the confirmation of serious differences in discussing the situation in a number of regions in the world, the Soviet side held a consistent course in quest of new approaches in the settlement of conflict situations, while firmly defending the right of all peoples to choose their own path of development without external interference.

The Politburo approved the results of the meeting of the leaders of Warsaw Pact member states in Berlin on 11 December 1987, which became a new link in the development of political cooperation between the fraternal parties and countries. It was noted with satisfaction that the participants in the meeting completely supported the accords reached in Washington and highly appraised their significance for strengthening the security of socialist countries and the world community as a whole. The Politburo stressed the importance of continuing the close contacts with the socialist countries for the whole duration of Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks, and of active interaction on topical problems of strengthening peace, security and goodneighborly cooperation in Europe and in other areas of world politics.

At the meeting of the Politburo proposals were considered on the need for a fundamental technical reequipping of the USSR railways. The accelerated development of the economy demands a corresponding development of railway transport and, above all, the supply of progressive types of rolling stock, other machinery and mechanisms, and automation facilities for the purpose of the full provision of transportation for the national economy and the population. The Politburo has recommended to the USSR State Planning Committee, the USSR Ministry of Railways, the USSR Council of Ministers' Bureau for Machine-Building, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR State Construction Committee, and the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply with the participation of other ministries and departments of the USSR which have an interest, to elaborate by 1989 a state program for the fundamental modernization of mainline railway transport in the years 1991-2000.

At the session of the Politburo, the first results of work in furthering the proposals put forward in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech in Murmansk on a radical lowering of military confrontation and on turning the North of our planet into a zone of peace and fruitful cooperation were summed up. It was noted that the Murmansk initiatives have been received with interest in all the states bordering on the Arctic. Yet the reaction of the United States and of the NATO leadership to the proposal on questions of limiting military activity in the region is so far not constructive. Measures were approved for further stepping up work with the aim of translating the Murmansk proposals onto the practical plane of dialogue both with the interested states and with the social forces of the Northern countries.

The Politburo approved the results of the visit of a delegation of the CPSU led by Comrade Ligachev to the 26th congress of the French Communist Party [PCF], which elaborated a course toward consolidating the positions of the French Communists in their selfless struggle for the interests of the working people, for peace and socialism. The Politburo noted with satisfaction the broad unity of views of the CPSU and the PCF on the fundamental problems of our time, and reaffirmed the willingness of the CPSU to continue to promote the development of the traditionally comradely relations between the Soviet and French Communists. The frank and businesslike spirit of the conversations held in Paris with French statesmen and political figures confirms the timeliness of continuing the Soviet-French dialogue. In modern conditions, the development of mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and France, and France's constructive participation in common efforts on disarmament and on the building of European security assume great importance.

The session heard a report by Comrade Zaykov on the meeting of first secretaries of city committees of the parties of the capitals of the socialist countries which was held in Warsaw. It was noted that in a situation in which the countries of socialism have entered a period of revolutionary renewal of all aspects of life, and of profound and creative quests and reforms, great importance is assumed by the study and utilization of combined experience and the further development and deepening of cooperation between the labor collectives, party, trade union, youth and other public organizations of the fraternal capitals.

Approval was given to the results of the conversations of Comrades Gorbachev and Gromyko with President Kaunda of the Republic of Zambia. The importance was stressed of expanding friendly Soviet-Zambian relations and of further strengthening the Soviet Union's contacts with the Frontline States and national liberation movements of southern Africa.

The session approved the results of Comrade Gorbachev's conversation and of the talks of Comrades Ryzhkov and Shevardnadze with Australian Prime Minister Hawke. The importance was noted of deepening the Soviet-Australian political dialogue with the aim of strengthening peace and security in the Asian and Pacific region and throughout the world, and of further expanding mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries in various spheres.

The session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo also discussed certain other current questions of the foreign policy of the CPSU and of the economic and social development of Soviet society.

Ryzhkov Tours Alma-Ata Pulp Combine
LD141803 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Nikolay Vanovich Ryzhkov arrived in Alma-Ata today. We have just received our correspondent's report:

[Begin video report by V. Glukhovtsev and V. Fast, identified by screen caption] On the same day, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited the Alma-Ata Pulp and Paper Combine. It is one of Kazakhstan's largest textile industry enterprise. Its workforce—more than 8,000 people are employed at the combine—produces annually in excess of 100 million meters of sateen, cotton, flannel and shirt fabrics. At the second textile factory, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov familiarized himself with the technology for producing yarn materials. Technical reequipment has been carried out intensively at the combine over the past few years: For instance, the new machine tools in the spinning mill made it possible to improve both the conditions of work and to treble its productivity. Equipment in the weaving shop is being renovated to a considerable extent, too. The technical reequipment has made it possible for the combine to exceed the rated capacities for the production of materials by one and a half times and to double the rated capacities for the production of yarn. The Alma-Ata Pulp and Paper Combine was one of the industry's first to commence, this year, to operate in the conditions of state acceptance and self-financing. Careful preparations had been made at the combine to go over to working in the new conditions.

All the same, when criteria for passing the output were made stricter along the entire course of the technological chain, there was a failure: Almost R19 million worth of materials and yarn failed to reach customers in the first 6 months. The situation is currently being put right—the combine is beginning to reach the planned targets for the production of ready materials.

Yevgeniy Fedorovich (Golubkin), the combine's director, informed Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov about all this. In conversations with the workers and foremen it was also noted that there were at the combine problems which the workforce was unable to resolve on its own. These include lower supplies of higher quality cotton strains, the shortages of chemicals and dyes and of essential technological equipment which, naturally, is reflected as a whole on the quality of materials manufactured.

However, difficulties notwithstanding, the combine's workforce is taking all measures so as to be able, already in the year 1988, to work systematically, without interruptions and to ensure without fail that the state plan and the 5-year plan as a whole are fulfilled.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov was accompanied at the Pulp and Paper Combine by Kolbin, first secretary of Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee; Nazarbayev, chairman of the Republican Council of Ministers; Klyuyev, USSR minister of light industry; and by other senior officials. [end video report]

Dolgikh Attends Communications Collegium
LD122054 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] In Moscow a collegium of the USSR Ministry of Communications has been held. It examined the work of the USSR Ministry of Communications to improve the service to the population in respect of telephones and other types of communications, and the preparation of enterprises for the transition to complete autonomous financing and self-financing. Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the Politburo, and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the collegium.

MOSCOW NEWS Discusses Yeltsin Case

LD161531 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—The former head of the Moscow Party organisation Boris Yeltsin had his special concept of perestroyka. He outlined it in his speech at the 27th party congress and in other speeches. It also expressed itself in what he did in practice. This is said by professor Gavriil Popov of Moscow University in his article "The Perestroyka We Need" printed in today's issue of the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS.

The scholar described Boris Yeltsin's stand as "authoritarian conservative vanguardism."

"Authoritarian—because leaders and not the masses are declared the main motive force of perestroyka. Vanguardism— because while being a fervent supporter of perestroyka Yeltsin attempted to reach its aim in one or two leaps while leaving behind the objective reality in the form of a multitude of most serious problems requiring a stage-by-stage solution and arduous daily work. Conservative—because while being doomed to barrenness in advance, such a method can only discredit perestroyka irrespective of the vanguardists' intentions and for this reason accords with the interests of our conservatives."

"The truth, as I see it, is that a part of society, including the vanguardists, sees the solution of perestroyka's problems not in the implementation of the concept of a radical economic reform and the closely associated democratisation of society, not in restructuring the mechanism of party, state and public life but first of all in the replacement of cadres," the professor writes.

"In the final analysis this is just another attempt to find easy and quick ways of doing something without really working for it. But not a single country or nation in history have ever solved their cardinal problems like that."

"Practice showed that for Moscow this concept had brought already a second 'purge of cadres' without any guarantee that a third or fourth would not follow. The only reliable criteria of objectively evaluating the ability of cadres to pursue perestroyka—unity of words and deeds—was absent and all that was left was to pin hopes on the first secretary's brilliant subjective ability to find 'foremen' for perestroyka."

"I am deeply convinced that perestroyka will be accomplished only if it draws into its stream the entire people and becomes the cause of every one of us," the article says.

"In Moscow, however, we were offered a situation with a single hero of perestroyka and with all the others being alloted the role of admiring spectators in a one-actor theatre. But it is long and well known that ideas of favours being showered from above inevitably degenerate, as it was shown already by Marx and Engels, into some form of barracks communism. While from our own history we know that Trotskiy made wide use of calls to 'impose' the revolution, to 'shape' it and to 'reshuffle cadres' while Stalin adhered to such slogans in practice."

"The complexity of the situation, as I see it, is that among the supporters of vanguardism who sometimes overdo with the pseudo-revolutionary phrase there are many unquestionably honest people, sincere and courageous Communists and gifted leaders. And when such people—and I list Boris Yeltsin among them without any reservations—discover that the matter is not in changing the crew but in rebuilding the ship itself, that the fulfilment of this task will require many years of work, sometimes without visible considerable results—manifestations of panic are possible among them. Hence the reckless calls to rush into a premature, ill-prepared attack which, moreover, is not backed up by superior numbers and for all these reasons is destined to defeat. And when such calls find themselves suspended in the vacuum of non-acceptance and are rejected—the question of resignation arises. This is how the vanguardism of perestroyka gives way to the vanguardism of capitulation."

In Gavriil Popov's opinion one of the most dangerous phenomena of perestroyka is that the vanguardism of a part of the working people has a base of its own. "There are many people in the country who want somebody to accomplish the perestroyka for them and present it to them on a silver dish. Such supporters of perestroyka, who perceive it as the exploit of some hero, really react to their idol's resignation as to something dramatic and almost the end of the world."

"The vanguardism of some and the passiveness of others go hand in glove," the article says. "They are not advancing but moving backwards. But the issue today is different: One cannot wait for perestroyka to be completed. It is imperative to act. Everybody must join in. Every one of us has more than ample opportunities for this. And if despite all this resistance to perestroyka is by no means diminishing the more pressing therefore is the need to unite the efforts of society's healthy forces to overcome this resistance. Even if we find in its ranks people whom we have grown accustomed to treat with respect."

Ukrainian CP Disciplines Officials

AU131417 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 6 Dec 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Excerpts] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat has examined ways to intensify efforts in the republic to perpetuate the memory of the homeland's defenders, and to invigorate the military and patriotic education of the working people. [passage omitted]

A report was heard on the work carried out by the Political Department of the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to raise the political and moral conditions of personnel, and to improve the activity of internal affairs organs so as to enhance legality amd law and order. It was noted that this activity still does not meet present requirements. Having called the attention of the Political Department of the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and of its chief, Comrade A.I. Borovik, personnally, to the low effectiveness of political organs' activity, the Central Committee demanded that this activity be radically restructured. The attention of the party committee in the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs (under Comrade V. I. Shapoval, secretary) has been directed to the need to make fuller use of the right to control the performance of the ministerial apparatus and to increase the responsibility of the Communist leaders in discharging their official duties, in tightening discipline in internal affairs organs, and in strictly complying with socialist legality.

The Central Committee has examined the item published in the newspaper RADYANSKA UKRAINA on 26 November under the title "Almost a Detective Story." Having listened to explanations given by N.P. Kompanets, Ukrainian SSR first deputy minister of grain products, about the facts presented in the item, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee noted that the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Grain Products (under I.I. Shmatolyan, minister) did not draw timely and proper conclusions from the results of inspections conducted by people's control organs at branch enterprises, and did not react either to critical remarks in the republic-level and local press, or to letters from the working people. The level of responsibility shown by the ministry's cadres in discharging official duties is low, and blatant violations of labor and technological discipline are not always being evaluated in adherence to principles. This leads to the waste of grain, flour, and other goods, as was correctly noted by the newspaper RADYANSKA UKRAINA.

Comrade N.P. Kompanets has been warned that if he fails to draw the appropriate conclusions and if the shortcomings noted occur again, he will be brought to stricter party account. It has been taken into consideration that the culprits directly responsible for the infringements that occurred at the Kiev grain products combine had been brought to party and disciplinary account by Podolskiy Raykom in the city of Kiev, and by the Kiev Oblast production administration for grain products.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has directed the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Grain Products to report in March 1988 on the measures taken to introduce order in the sphere of safekeeping and processing products at the enterprises subordinated to it, and to improve the quality of products. This will be reported in the press.

Moldavian Secretary Replies to Criticism

PM170921 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Reply by N. Bondarchuk, secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, under the rubric "In Response to Criticism": "'Yesterday and Today'"]

[Text] N. Bondarchuk, secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, reports that the article under the headline "Yesterday and Today" published in PRAVDA 12 September has been discussed at a session of the republic Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat. It was noted that the article had sharply and with good reason focused on important problems of the restructuring of the work with cadres and correctly raised questions connected with the consequences of past mistakes, distortions, and overreporting.

After the 27th CPSU Congress republic party committees began to accumulate new experience in cadre work. However, the changes for the better have still become permanent. The promotion to higher posts of a number of former party raykom first secretaries was a mistake. The newspaper noted correctly that the strongest opposition to democratic approaches in the work with cadres is evident wherever leading posts are held by people who have secured them through protection or nepotism. In resolutely ridding themselves of these people, certain party committees have swung to the other extreme, which has resulted in an unjustifiably high tunrover of leading personnel. Around 20% of economic managers have been replaced in the republic as a whole over the past year.

Quite a few cadre changes are being carried out without the in-depth clarification and elimination of the causes which led up to them and without consulting a wide circle of people. Individual party gorkoms and raykoms have not mastered such an important aspect of party work as the ability to value and look after cadres. Inertia, complacence, the administrative-command style of work, window dressing, and formalism have not yet been overcome everywhere. This was graphically demonstrated during the reports and elections held in party organizations during which the work of 67 party leaders was judged unsatisfactory.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee has instructed party committees to persistently improve the style of their work, to give it a democratic content, and to accumulate cadre work experience which will make the maximum contribution to restructuring. The task has been set—building on the work that has been started—of resolutely eliminating the negative consequences of the past and to get rid of opportunists, careerists, and all kinds of renegades as swiftly as possible. At the same time an unjustified cadre turnover must be avoided. It has been decided to analyze and objectively assess what has been done to eliminate deception and overreporting and to apply tougher punishment

measures to people guilty of overreporting and misrepresentation. The problem of work with cadres in the republic which was dealt with in the article will be discussed at the next plenum of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

Yaroslavl Auto Workers Protest Work Schedules
LD151739 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Excerpts] Yaroslavl, 15 Dec (TASS)—Nelli Grigoryan, a TASS correspondent, reports:

A group of workers from the motor plant in the town of Yaroslavl (300 km northeast of Moscow) held a meeting last Saturday at their enterprise, demanding that the administration alter the work schedule and ensure smoothness and evenness in the production process. The director of the plant and the leaders of the trade union admitted their errors and promised to satisfy the worker's demands in the next few days.

The reason for the conflict was the so-called "working Saturdays", that is days off when, at the request of the administration, the workers go to work as on ordinary days. So far this year there have been 20 such "working Saturdays" at this works. Some people at the plant grew accustomed to this, and others just grinned and bore it. [passage omitted]

But last Saturday, some of the workers did not leave the enterprise at the end of their shift but instead set off for the plant management building. There they unfurled two posters: "We are for Glasnost and Restructuring" and "We are for Eight Working Saturdays". There then followed a demand to meet with the plant director. Plant General Director Vitaliy Doletskiy invited the workers into the conference hall, where members of the plant party and trade union committees also came. There began an open conversation between ordinary workers and the plant management. [passage omitted]

But plant management proved to be ill-prepared for a frank conversation. Therefore it was necessary to continue it on following days. The director of the plant and the leaders of the public organizations admitted their errors. It has been decided to ascertain the opinion of all workers at workers' assemblies in the coming days and to find a solution to the problem that would satisfy their demands.

"Ours is a common cause; together we need to learn democracy, too," said Vitaliy Doletskiy, the plant director. "These recent events have been a useful lesson for us all. The more so because the tasks facing the plant collective can only be resolved in together, and with a high degree of responsibility by each person for the results of his labor."

Kamchatka Inhabitants Protest Research Work
LD171603 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 17 Dec 87

[From the "Sidelights on Soviet Life" program, with unidentified presenter]

[Excerpt] A group of experts who some time ago started research in the Kamchatka Peninsula in the USSR Far East for building a hydropower station have had to curtail their activity following protests from the local population. The research team have been evacuated by helicopter. This incident started lively discussion of ecological problems in local newspapers. [passage omitted]

Commission Examines Antipollution Efforts
PM171003 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Concern for Nature"]

[Text] A scheduled session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Commission for Environmental Protection and the Rational Use of Resources was held 14 December.

The commission discussed environmental protection and the use of natural resources in Maritime Kray. It was noted that the leaders of the USSR Ministries of the Shipbuilding Industry, of the Maritime Fleet, of Power and Electrification, of the Fish Industry, of Nonferrous Metallurgy, of the Construction Materials Industry, the USSR State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products, and a number of other ministries whose enterprises are situated on the kray's territory are unsatisfactorily implementing measures to protect the atmosphere, waters, timber and mineral resources, and fauna. The amount of noxious substances discharged into the atmosphere in cities and other population centers in the kray has not only not been reduced but has even risen by 4% in the last 3 years and by 8% in Vladivostok. More than 100 million cubic metres of contaminated industrial and household waste water are discharged into the Zaliv Petra Velikogo every year. The concentration of pesticides from rice fields' drainage waters is several times above the permissible level in Lake Khanka's coastal waters. The USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry and the USSR State Committee for Forestry are not taking practical measures to ensure the rational, comprehensive use of the kray's timber resources and reduce timber losses at every stage of its procurement and processing. Available stocks of larch wood and other types of deciduous wood are being poorly assimilated, while areas and stocks of particularly valuable cedar wood are rapidly diminishing. Timber procurement enterprises are destroying economically valuable types of timber at the sapling stage over thousands of hectares and cluttering up clearings

with discarded timber, which makes reforestation work in these clearings extremely difficult. The damage done to nature and the national economy by forest fires has not diminished.

The USSR Ministries of Construction in the Far East and Transbaykal Regions and of Transport Construction are being extremely slow to build purifying plants in Vladivostok and Nakhodka.

Maritime Krayispolkom does not properly exercise its legal right to monitor the observance of environmental protection legislation by those enterprises and organizations under various USSR ministries and departments situated on the kray's territory.

The decision approved by the commission outlines a complex of measures to improve environmental protection work in the kray. USSR Ministers Comrades Babenko and Brezhnev had their attention drawn to the unsatisfactory work of organizations under the USSR Ministry of Construction in the Far East and Transbaykal Regions and the USSR Ministry of Transport Construction concerning the construction of water treatment plants.

The commission discussed the question of implementation of the 16 January 1976 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Measures To Prevent Pollution of the Black Sea and Azov Sea." It was noted that by 1987 the measures outlined by the resolution had been carried out at 5,433 of the 6,785 enterprises, organizations, and population centers responsible for polluting reservoirs; this figure includes 393 of the 426 biggest enterprises and 87 of the 107 cities concerned. The amount of raw sewage discharged into the Black Sea and Azov Sea has fallen by 4.3 billion cubic metres per year in comparison with 1975, or by 57%. A complex of measures has been implemented to prevent the pollution of seas and rivers by shipping, and work is being done to reduce pollution of the environment by chemical plant-protection agents and mineral fertilizers. The measures taken have made it possible to improve the condition of the water in the Dnepr, the Don, the Kuban, the southern part of the Bug, and some other rivers. On the whole, however, the sanitary and ecological condition of the Azov Sea and Black Sea and many rivers that flow into them is still unfavorable. When construction plans are being drawn up water conservancy projects are regarded as secondary considerations, planning estimates are not submitted on time, and the projects are inadequately financed. In 1976-1986, for example, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers allocated less than 50% of the capital investments required for these purposes. Despite a surplus of estimated cost of R96 million, the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers allocates just R5-7 million per year for water conservancy projects. But less than 50% of even these scant resources are being used at certain construction sites.

The commission instructed the RSFSR, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Georgian, and Moldavian SSR Councils of Ministers, and the ministries and departments whose enterprises are situated in this region to ensure the completion of basic measures in 1988-1990 to stop the pollution of the Black Sea and Azov Sea, regarding this task as one of particular importance from a social and environmental protection standpoint. The commission session was chaired by V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Poll Concludes Majority Support Perestroyka

LD140946 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—Out of the 10,000 people polled in a sociological survey, conducted by the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee in 15 regions of the USSR 71.5 percent noticed "changes for the better in many fields of public life." Only 9.3 percent said they did not feel such changes.

"The Soviet people regard perestroyka as a programme which embodies their vital interests and requirements," one of the organisers of the poll, Valeriy Shchegortsov, candidate of science (philosophy), told TASS. "The survey showed the majority of the respondents were ready to take an active part in the drive for restructuring. Its success primarily depends on the qualitative and effective work of everyone at his or her place of work. As many as 81.3 percent said their work could be more effective than it was now. In a similar survey four years ago, 63 percent expressed readiness to work better."

The comparison of the results of the current survey with those of the 1983 poll indicates that political passivity and social inertness of many people—the result of stagnation in the country's social life in the 70's and early 80's—is being gradually overcome. Some 28 percent mentioned them four years ago as against 13.7 percent now.

Religious Leaders Hold 'Traditional Meeting'

LD172125 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—The traditional meeting of heads and representatives of all churches and religious associations in the USSR held in the Trinity St. Sergius Lavra, near Moscow, was followed by a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Speaking at the press conference, chairman of the External Church Relations Department of the Moscow Patriarchy, Metropolitan of Minsk and Belorussia Filaret has said that the meeting passed in a warm, friendly, fraternal atmosphere, marked with mutual understanding, the atmosphere up to the invariable real mutual relationships between religious circles in the USSR. [sentence as

received] The address of the participants in the meeting to the religious workers and the congregation was distributed at the press conference.

The meeting at the Trinity St. Sergius Lavra was held in the remarkable year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution which was celebrated by the whole of the Soviet people, the address says. The date was the boundary opening up new horizons of free, creative, inspired labour to every person for the good of the whole of the people. On the historical path traversed, "The believers shared in full with the whole people both the joy of great victories and the bitterness of irreplaceable losses."

The address underlines the high mission which is now assigned to man as a socially active personality—fair, conscientious, open for perception of lofty spiritual values. It is noted that leaders of churches and religious associations denounce phenomena of nihilistic attitude to religious life traditions, being witnessed in different religions. They consider it inadmissible for some persons to try groundlessly to usurp the right to express the interests of believers. The words about "purity of religion" are frequently used to cover up the striving to inflict a damage on spiritual unity.

The religious leaders, known by their peace-making works, welcome in the address the treaty which was signed in Washington between the USSR and the USA on the elimination of the intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, as the first step towards nuclear disarmament. The document calls "for praying and promoting cooperation of states and peoples in the process of disarmament and detente."

The signatories to the address are the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Pimen, the Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians Vazgen the First, Catholicos Patriarch of All Georgia Ilya the Second, the Archbishop of Moscow and All Russia Olympiy (the Old Believers' Church), Chairman of the Supreme Old Believers' Council in Lithuania Ivan Yegorov, Chairman of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian-Baptists Vasiliy Logvinenko, chairman of the Ecclesiastical Board of Moslems of Central Asia and Kazakhstan Mufti Shamsutdinkhan Babakhanov, chairman of the Ecclesiastical Board of Moslems of the Transcaucasus Sheykh ol-Islam Allashukur Pashayev, the chief Rabbi of the Moscow Choral Synagogue Adolf Shayevich, Deputy Chairman of the Central Ecclesiastical Board of the Buddhists of the USSR Chimid Dorzhi Dugarov [name as received] and other church dignitaries.

Answering Journalists' questions, Metropolitan Filaret dwelt on the trip made by a group of Christians of the USSR to Washington undertaken at the invitation of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA in the days of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the capital of the United States. He shared impressions of joint divine services at the Episcopalian Church in Washington, the prayer for success of the meeting of the leaders of the two countries.

Leningrad Human Rights Group Member Jailed

AU111945 Paris AFP in English 1931 GMT 11 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 11 (AFP)—A Leningrad representative of the dissident Trust Group movement was arrested Thursday during a demonstration held to mark International Human Rights day and jailed for two weeks on a "hooliganism" charge, a Moscow member of the group told AFP Friday.

In a telephone call, the source said that Anatoliy Dubkov had been with a group of 50 human rights campaigners at the demonstration in the Mikhailovski gardens of central Leningrad.

City officials organised a "counter-demonstration" of 50 other people at the same time and place, the source said, adding that participants at the two meetings had discussed their views with each other. Police dispersed the meeting with loud-hailers after an hour, he said.

Timofeyev Announces Monitoring Group

AU151704 Paris AFP in English 1657 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 15 (AFP)—Soviet dissidents who defied a ban by authorities and staged a human rights seminar here, Tuesday ended six days of discussions by setting up a permanent commission which would continue to monitor human rights violations in the Soviet Union, organiser Lev Timofeyev told reporters.

Mr Timofeyev said at the end of the meeting attended by 300 people, including foreign representatives, that his Press Club Glasnost which organised the event wanted the seminar to be the start of a "permanent process" to monitor human rights in the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The former political prisoner said the group would cooperate with organisations such as the Vienna-based International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, whose executive director Gerald Nagler attended the Moscow seminar.

The monitoring group idea appeared to be inspired by that set up in the wake of the 1975 Helsinki Act by Soviet dissidents including Andrey Sakharov. But the group disbanded after most of its members were imprisoned or exiled.

Participants at the Moscow meeting from different Soviet republics braved warnings from authorities that the seminar was illegal. "Tens" of Soviet delegates were prevented from attending, according to Mr Timofeyev,

including one Ukrainian and an Armenian who were organising a workshop on nationalities. Others from the Baltic states, Leningrad and Tashkent were also prevented from reaching Moscow.

A representative of the Crimean Tartars managed to reach Moscow for a Saturday session of the seminar, but on Sunday he was sent back to Simferopol on the Black Sea, according to Mr Timofeyev.

Mr. Timofeyev could not say how many foreign guests were unable to obtain visas, although West German Greens politician Petra Kelly was among those refused entry permission.

Soviet authorities refused to provide premises for the meeting, and prevented the official opening of the seminar last Thursday by declaring a banquet hall, which had been privately rented, closed for disinfection.

Two subsequent plenary sessions in two other halls could not take place as scheduled as the rooms were suddenly closed for "technical reasons" or "fire emergency", Mr Timofeyev said.

However the authorities did not move to stop participants from holding workshops in suburban apartments, although an AFP reporter saw KGB officials permanently stationed outside the buildings where the workshops on issues ranging from religious rights to the press were taking place.

"Three or four years ago, all the participants would have been arrested," Mr Timofeyev commented.

He said that many of the resolutions adopted by the 10 sections of the seminar would be sent to the Soviet government. The top priority for the seminar organisers, he indicated, was to press for the release of political prisoners. According to Larisa Bogoraz, the widow of dissident Anatoliy Marchenko who died in detention in December last year, 20 Soviet prisoners of conscience are known to be still jailed.

But Mrs Bogoraz, who chaired a workshop on human rights attended by 50 people, said that it was impossible to know the exact figure of political prisoners, who included people imprisoned for their religious beliefs.

Among resolutions adopted by the workshops were calls for Soviet troops to pull out of Afghanistan, an end to the death penalty in all 35 countries which signed the Helsinki Final Act, and religious and press freedom in the Soviet Union.

On Saturday, the seminar's group on the press chaired by dissident Sergey Grigoriyants founded a Soviet trade union of independent journalists, and is negotiating to be the Eastern bloc's first member of the International Federation of Journalists. Mr Grigoriyants, who edits the non-official journal GLASNOST, is already a member of the Brussels-based organisation.

The press workshop also demanded the release of French journalist Alain Guillo, imprisoned in Kabul after being taken captive with a group of Afghan rebels.

Concerning the organisation of an official human rights conference in Moscow, Mr Nagler said that a delegation from his organisation had been invited to the Soviet Union for talks with a range of government officials on human rights. The 20-man delegation from the international federation hoped to come to Moscow in January, he said.

"We will then take a stand on what we think about a Moscow conference" on human rights, Mr Nagler said. Western countries have so far hesitated to give a positive answer to Moscow's invitation, stressing that more progress on human rights was needed by Soviet authorities, in addition to guarantees that such a conference would take place in a conducive atmosphere.

Tolkunov Queried on Human Rights Day

LD091727 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

A meeting of the representatives of the public devoted to the Day of Human Rights will take place in Moscow tomorrow. This day is observed annually in keeping with the United Nations decision. A TASS diplomatic correspondent approached Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Chairman of the USSR parliamentary group, who will preside at the meeting with a question: "What, do you think, is man's foremost right?"

The stern realities of the nuclear age instantly prompt one to think with anxiety about man's foremost right—the right to life, about what has been done by today to guarantee solidly this right, Lev Tolkunov said. [sentence as received] The course of international developments gives a hopeful answer to this question. For the first time in history a practical step was taken towards removing the most dangerous weapon jeopardizing life on earth. The leaders of the USSR and the United States have just signed a treaty to eliminate medium-range and shorter-range missiles and their nuclear warheads.

However, a good deal is still to be done on this road, the Soviet parliamentarian emphasized. The assertion, in keeping with the U.N. Charter, of the faith in the fundamental human rights, in the dignity and value of human personality, in the equality of men and women, of big and small nations imperatively demands the pooling of the efforts of all states and public forces of the globe, suggests broad international cooperation.

The efforts of the world community in the field of human rights should be concentrated, first and foremost, on preventing gross and mass violations of human rights, removing any forms of the abuse of personality, on solving key and global problems of our time, affecting the destinies and rights of whole nations and of the individual.

I am confident that at the meeting of the Moscow public a lot will be said about the work for peace, which is a synonym to the work for man's right to life, Lev Tolkunov said in conclusion.

Withdrawals of Emigration Requests Noted

LD071415 Moscow TASS in English 1338 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Kiev December 7 TASS—"I ask to consider my application for an exit visa to Israel as invalid". The Kiev visa-issuing authority has been receiving such requests in increasing numbers lately.

This statement was written, for instance, by Anatoliy Bedovoy. He wanted to emigrate in 1979 but was denied visa because by virtue of his profession he knew some state secrets of the USSR.

"Certainly, I was exasperated then", says Anatoliy. "But years have passed and I am glad now that I did not emigrate. The term of statutory limitations ran out but I will not leave the homeland".

"We frequently hear such statements", Dmitriy Komar, head of the Kiev visa office, told TASS. "Many persons of the Jewish nationality who earlier persistently pressed for an exit visa, are now drawing back their applications. At the same time, ever more people who left the USSR regard as happiness the chance to return to their country". Among those who have recently returned from the United States Komar named the Shkadron couple, Anatoliy Kholodenko, Grigory Seri and others.

Refuseniks Accused of Disrupting Peace Rally

PM121527 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 p 3

[S. Mikhaylov and M. Sashkov article: "Start the Clock of a Nuclear-Free World"]

[Text] Sunday turned out to be a working day for Nina Vasilyevna Rebrova. She left home in good time so as not to be late for the start of her shift. She crossed the Sadovoye Beltway opposite the MVD building and it was there, in the small square, that she heard words which made her stop and join the hundreds of people surrounding a makeshift rostrum. These words were about the most important issue now perturbing people—about peace, the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, our children's future; about the things that are most precious and sacred for every mother, for every honest person. And they were being spoken by housewife and heromother L. Zakharova.

And just like N. Rebrova, dozens of other Muscovites who found themselves there around midday on Sunday stopped and listened to these words expressing the innermost feelings and aspirations of each and every one of them. The rally of Moscow's peace champions was in progress.

It was no accident that hundreds of the capital's citizens gathered there on that particular Sunday. A truly historic moment was about to occur in the life of all mankind—it was only a matter of hours before M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan were due to sign an agreement which was to become the first step in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. That was said by Hero of Socialist Labor P. Vindyukov, heat specialist at the No 1 Bearings Plant, and V. Degtyarev, team leader at the S. Ordzhonikidze machine tool building plant, who addressed the rally. Amplified by the microphone, the words of the poet A. Markov echoed into the distance: "We all are earthlings, and we all must rally for the sake of a great goal—the preservation of human civilization."

This idea ran through every speech and was reflected in dozens of antiwar banners.

People from different generations and professions followed each other on the makeshift rostrum. A worker was followed by a scientist, a poet by a student. In all likelihood every word spoken by them could today be repeated by people living in all corners of the earth, in Europe, America, Africa, Australia, and Asia; they could subscribe to the words written on one of the banners, which seem to sum up the will and resolve of the peoples: "Missiles on the Scrap Heap? I'm 'For!'" Yes, mankind's moment of destiny has come in the destruction of nuclear arsenals, in the affirmation of a world without wars, violence, and weapons instead of a world with new rounds of the arms race and the deadly vicious circle of "Star Wars."

That was said by V. Solntsev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Linguistics Institute and corresponding member of the Academy, and by journalist I. Fesunenko; lines of poetry were recited about it. On listening to the speakers, one automatically recalled a photograph taken in Reykjavik. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee looking at his watch during a meeting with R. Reagan. Today this photograph, taken at the Hovdi House, is particularly symbolic. Today mankind is hopefully looking at the clock of its history, whose hands say that the time of a nuclear-free world has come.

Unfortunately, however, by no means everyone is prepared to attune their lives to this clock. Some people would like to turn its hands back, to slow down the peace

dialogue, to draw attention away from the most important element in mankind's life today, and to exploit for their selfish purposes the situation of openness and glasnost which is now the determining factor of our social life. This also happened at last Sunday's rally, when a small group of people, so-called refuseniks, held forth about "human rights" and "democracy" and tried to wreck the Moscow public's rally. Especially diligent in fueling the question of emigration, these people were not in the least averse to insulting the patriotic feelings of Muscovites who were indignant at their malicious outbursts.

This action, obviously planned in advance, was calculated to draw mainly the attention of Western correspondents who had surrounded the provocateurs. Foreign journalists made no secret of the fact that they had been notified in advance "by telephone" about the "assembly" of these "fighters" for rights. And here is something amazing: The representatives of the foreign mass media could not have cared less about what Muscovites felt and said at the rally, literally turning their backs on its participants. Instead television and still camera lenses were focused on the tiny raging group, and microphones were brought close to its members. Furthermore, the behavior by some correspondents made one think that, in the quest for "sensations," they had forgotten not only their professional duty but also the elementary norms of behavior in the country where they are posted. In reply to reasonable remarks made by Muscovites who became indignant at such actions, one American journalist let fly. The correspondent who went beyond all bounds had to be brought back to his senses with help from the militia, and an appropriate protocol has been drawn up.

So, what was the objective of those who tried to exploit the Muscovites' rally for the purpose of political self-advertisement in front of Western television camera lenses? A few brief conversations with these individuals give a clear idea of the way they think and their moral character. Here, for example, we had someone by the name of Leya Chernobylskaya telling foreign correspondents in a strained voice that her children live in permanent fear. True enough, for some reason she did not actually specify who it was that frightened them, because she had nothing to say. Right away she admitted that her older daughter, a student at a technical college, receives a higher grant. An extended pause followed a question as to how her words about the hostile treatment of her daughter by teachers and students at the technical college should be reconciled with the fact that she receives a higher grant.

Another "fighter" for his rights was more frank:

"I don't want to live in your country! I don't love anyone here and I want to leave your country!"

Let us emphasize the word "your." He does not consider our country to be his, and yet he was born and grew up here, he received his higher education here. His children grew up here. Nonetheless, he considers this country to be foreign.

What can be added to all this? Just this: These people—and they are just isolated individuals—have themselves built a fence separating them from other people who, in that very same spot, just a couple of steps away, were raising their voices in defense of the main human right—the right to live, the right to enjoy peace.

Here is what construction worker I. Khasyanov said on this subject. He works at the "Soyuzgazavtomatika" All-Union Science and Production Association. He was at the rally with his small daughter.

"I live not too far from here," I. Khasyanov said. "We came out for a breath of fresh air. I noticed from the distance the banners: 'We Are for Peace! No to War!' I came closer.... How could I not join in! Here is my daughter, growing up, I want her to grow up beneath clear skies. The only thing I don't understand is why this small group of windbags and demagogues has come here, prattling on about some infringement of rights, imposing on us their views of patriotism. We have Belorussians and Tajiks, Russians and Azerbaijanis, Ukrainians and Jews working shoulder to shoulder at our construction site.... I myself am a Tatar. We live in friendship. A truly international collective. All this talk about the infringement of some nationality's rights only creates an obstacle, distracts us from the main work. What could be more important than the struggle for peace?"

This is how the majority of Muscovites think, having expressed their will for peace in the resolution which was unanimously adopted by the rally.

The unity of people of goodwill is the guarantee that the clock of a nuclear-free world will be started.

U.S. Citing False Figures on Refuzniks

AU171026 Paris AFP in English 1019 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 17 (AFP)—A Soviet commentator Thursday accused the West of producing "false figures" on the number of Soviet citizens refused emigration permission, quoting an Interior Ministry figure of 732 refuzniks in a bid to set the record straight.

In an article in the daily KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, a NOVOSTI press agency commentator said the "false figures" had been produced in order to "fuel distrust towards the Soviet policy of openness and democratisation".

He quoted the U.S. State department as saying that "thousands" of Soviet citizens had been refused permission, while Israeli sources put the number of Jews wanting to emigrate at 400,000. He added that another figure mentioned in the West was 11,000 Jewish refuzniks, and American television journalist Tom Brokaw had spoken of 4,000 people waiting for an exit visa in an NBC television interview with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Thursday's article quoted Soviet Interior Minister Alexander Vlasov as saying that in the first 11 months of this year, 7,007 people had left the Soviet Union.

But this figure, analysts said, corresponds to the number of Soviet Jews only who have left. According to the head of the Soviet visa office, in an interview last month, more than 26,000 people received emigration permission this year.

Asked about the number of refuzniks, he said there were 732, who had mostly been turned down because they held state secrets. He added that among the 732 were Soviet Jews, but did not say how many.

According to the Soviet refuznik community, there are 20,000 Jewish refuzniks waiting to leave.

Mr. Vlasov's tally also appeared to contradict a figure advanced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. During a press conference in Washington last week at the end of his summit meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan, he said that 220 Soviet citizens had been refused permission to emigrate, and this was because they held state secrets.

Amnesties Effect on Moscow Crime Reported

PM161113 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 6

[V. Korneyev report: "Echo of Amnesty" under rubric "From Competent Sources"]

[Text] "Might the amnesty affect the law enforcement situation in the city?" This was the question asked in June—immediately after the publication of the well-known USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree—by our correspondent in a conversation with the leadership of the Moscow militia (IZVESTIYA No 180). The answer was unequivocal: "We need have no fear of an outbreak of crime." Almost 6 months have passed since then. Then, just the other day, the question of the amnesty and the work being done in the city with those freed under the amnesty came up again at a briefing at the Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration.

The humanity shown the transgressors by this act was emphasized. It was also made clear that law enforcement organs are not only responsible for releasing these people but also for assisting them with problems concerning housing, registration, and employment.

The registration of those freed under the amnesty is being specially supervised by the city internal affairs administration. Let us make it clear that those people who, under the terms of the amnesty, have had their criminal record annulled have to be registered at the place of residence of their families or relatives with whom they have lived. With the latter's consent, of course. A total of 1,050 freed prisoners are registered in the city to date (on the whole this was done within 10 days).

As far as restrictions are concerned, a list of articles relating to restrictions on registration in the city of Moscow can be found in all corrective labor institutions.

The next problem is finding employment. At present 66.1% of those freed under the amnesty have found employment in the city with the help of the militia on condition that they are registered. The militia is of the opinion that these people should not be assigned to stores to work as loaders but should be sent to the best enterprises where there are stable collectives and strong labor traditions. In short, we should not be afraid of spoiling the statistics. At present, however, contact has not been made everywhere with enterprises and some of the freed prisoners have still to be found patrons. Unfortunately, these people sometimes get out of control and break the law....

A few words about investigative practice. Between 18 June and 6 December a total of 275 criminal cases involving 315 people were terminated under the terms of the amnesty. Unfortunately, they included people who did not appreciate society's humane attitude. The following example was given at the briefing. A 40-year-old shop foreman sold some tomatoes for R600 and pocketed the money herself. She was caught and then freed under the amnesty. Her case was terminated. After this, having risen to the position of shop chief (!), she appropriated a far larger sum of money—almost R5,000....

A few words about juveniles freed under the amnesty. There are 30 of them in Moscow. As many as 28 have returned to the city and the criminal cases of 2 of them have been terminated. According to the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department, these young people are proving complicated and are having considerable difficulty in integrating themselves back into society. Four of the 30 are still unemployed. Another sad statistic is that the amnesty has not helped two of them: One has committed an act of hooliganism and another stabbed someone....

Finally, as the IZVESTIYA correspondent was told on this occasion at the Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration, the return of those freed under the amnesty has not really complicated the law enforcement situation in the capital.

Citizens Interviewed About Street Crimes

OW160827 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 11 Dec 87

[From the "90 Minutes" program; A. Krutov report]

[Text] The Main Administration of Internal Affairs of Moscow City Executive Committee holds weekly briefings at 38 Petrovka, Moscow. Various topics of maintainance of law and order in our large city are discussed

there. Journalists are informed about the number of accidents, crimes, the kinds of breaches of law and order, the things to be paid attention to, and those to be taken under special control. This kind of information used to be considered for official use, but now everyone knows about it, and one can say that this is one example of glasnost which is now being carried out in our country. Let us watch the reportage I recorded in one of Moscow streets.

[Begins recording] [Krutov] I have a question: Is Moscow a relatively quiet city, in respect to crimes?

[Unidentified man] You know, we have not had any direct contacts with crimes. Judging by the VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA articles, it is not quite a quiet city.

[Krutov] No? Are you afraid to return home alone late at night?

[Unidentified woman] You know, I do not walk late, but I probably would be afraid.

[Krutov] Do we have to speak about problems, such as narcotics, prostitution, and drug addiction?

[Man] I think, this is the main question now—narcotics and drug addiction. Even here you can meet—I come here to have a total rest, because this is my homeland, and we moved to another rayon, but we lived here, and I went to school here, and was born here—at night one can see a young man with fish eyes, pardon the expression. He does not understand anything, does not see anybody around him, he does not need anything. They spoil our recreation.

[Krutov] Are you afraid to walk home alone late at night?

[Second unidentified woman] I guess not.

[Krutov] But is it better if someone meets you?

[Woman] Of course, it is better.

[Krutov] Tell me, please: Do you think Moscow is a quiet city, in respect to crimes?

[Third unidentified woman] Oh! Ask me an easier question. Luckily, I have never met any criminals. I hope I never meet any.

[Krutov] Are you satisfied with the work of militia? Do you think that it secures the order we have now?

[Man] Things are different in different rayons. When the decree on the antialcoholism struggle was issued, the aggregations, the mobs near stores disappeared. These mobs used to swear, and do other such things. These things have gone. It was eliminated. But now these groups reappear and the militia does not pay any attention. [end recording]

As you noticed, comrades, the Muscovites, on the whole, say that Moscow is a quiet city. There are, however, complaints about the militia. I think it is so in any city. You may have recognized the street where the interviews were made. Some may have visited there, some may have seen it on TV. It is the Arbat. It is the only pedestrian thoroughfare in our capital. It is attracting great attention now. Here are some figures. On weekdays it is visited by 10,000-15,000 people, in the evenings by 20,000-25,000, and on weekends and holidays—60,000 or more. There are other figures; they were discussed at one of the 38 Petrovka briefings. A whole section was devoted to the Arbat situation. During the 8 months of this year, 3,000 were detained there for various breaches of law and order. No other Moscow street causes so much worry as the Arbat does. How to solve the problems that have accumulated in the Arbat? It is planned to open more pedestrian streets in Moscow. This, of course, worries the city authorities, and they have something to think about.

Antidrugs Chief on Combatting Addiction

LD151307 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] A coordinating conference in the Moscow Procurator's Office was devoted to the problems of combatting drug addiction. It was noted that the special program adopted by the Moscow city soviet in August so far is not being fulfilled in a satisfactory way. Our correspondent, Anatoliy Fedorov, talks with (Eduard Semenovich Drazhdov), chief narcologist of the city.

[Fedorov] Eduard Semonovich, tell me, how many drug addicts and toxic substance abusers currently are registered in Moscow?

[(Drazhdov)] There are in Moscow 710 drug addicts, 510 toxic substance abusers. The group at risk is more than 1,500 people. Recently, the number of those seeking help has increased sharply. An intolerable situation has arisen and they feel the necessity of turning to a doctor. The criminal investigation department has worked well and has closed down channels of supply and marketing of narcotic substances. Control over a whole range of medical substances has been stepped up, all though many questions still remain. The first question now is the organization of a toxicological laboratory. We will be able—the necessary prerequisites are there—to determine any substance being used by an adolescent or adult, even if (?only once). We have invited specialists from the antidoping center. It is particularly good for checking when we are dealing with a drug addict who has been on the list for a long time. It makes it possible to check whether or not he is using this or that particular narcotic substance.

What else do we need to do to strengthen the material base? There often has been talk of a differentiated approach. Now we are setting up special blocks for adolescents, both boys and girls, in order to give them

the necessary education and treatment, and on the other hand to separate them from the group of out-and-out drug addicts so that it should not be a sort of school. The drug addicts undergoing treatment, themselves requested help in finding work and adapting to society after they come out of the hospital. So we are now engaged in these questions also.

[Fedorov] How effective is the treatment actually?

[(Drazhdov)] In the drug clinics about 20-24% of people have not been using narcotic substances for more than a year. We are now putting together a consultative section for adolescents and for their families to which they can turn for advice. If anyone has a question, they can ring 119-33-11. The phone works round-the-clock; they can get information, and if someone is shy they can get a consultation from them.

[Fedorov] Your personal opinion as a man: What do you think is the reason for the growth in drug addiction and its involving younger and younger people?

[(Drazhdov)] Probably the fact that narcotic substances are being offered to young people. Drug pushers offer it to young people and they, out of youth and lack of understanding, join in. However, I also think that we should combat smoking. He knows he shouldn't but he smokes nevertheless. This then leads to permission to use alcohol, and then to permission to use narcotic substances. Perhaps he thinks something like this: Let's try just once; I'll see, then stop. One time can lead to tragedy. We must carry out preventative educational work, and work out quite different qualitative attitudes to all kinds of drug users, for the government decision says that drug use must be rooted out of the life of our society—all kinds, whether alcohol, narcotics, or any other (?chemical). Very probably there still isn't an understanding of the problem, that a chemical (?attack) affects the whole organism; it is a wound without pain or blood which destroys the whole organism. Not feeling the danger, many still think that using it just once could give them pleasure, simply to find out, (?but) this one-time use leads to rather serious consequences, to serious dependence [words indistinct].

Housing Swindles, Scandals Uncovered

LD111642 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 11 Dec 87

[Text] Facts of the crudest violation of the principles of social justice in the distribution of housing have been exposed in Tashkent. As was noted at a session of the bureau of the party city committee, despite the growth in the volume of housing construction, the number of people wishing to obtain an apartment is not only not being reduced but, on the contrary, is increasing. In the past 2 years alone, the list of those in the queue has increased by over 10,000. A check has revealed dozens of facts where those working in housing offices are deliberately concealing the released housing from the records. A total of over 1,000 such apartments have been exposed. There are instances where accommodation is being allocated to individuals who have no right to claim it. For example, in the Oktyabrskiy Rayon executive committee, one Ulichev, an employee of the Leather Goods and Sporting Goods Association, who possesses his own house, was brought to account. Bypassing all laws, one Lysyak, who had arrived in Tashkent on vacation obtained a three-room cooperative apartment.

Bureaucracy and redtape in issuing authorization to occupy an apartment is evoking justified indignation among the working people. Much empty accommodation has been found in Kuybyshevskiy and Frunzenskiy Rayons. With the acute shortage of apartments, the practice of squandering accommodation for the use of various offices, consumer services and organizations has developed in the town.

The bureau of the Tashkent City Party Committee has adopted a specific decision to quickly eliminate the situation which has been created. The violators of the housing legislation have been heavily punished by the town executive committee and raycom.

American Videotape 'Smuggler' Caught

AU191827 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 13 Nov 87 p 3

[P. Vilkhovyy report: "An Interview 'on the Sly'"]

[Excerpts] At first, it was a case of banal and not particularly resourceful smuggling. Last September a group of tourists from the United States of America, who were about to depart for Vienna, passed through customs control at Borispol airport. The leader of the group, Martha Kolomiyets, a 28-year-old resident of New York, declared $34 allegedly left from foreign currency which she brought in, as well as gold trinkets and three video cassettes which she had declared upon arrival in our country 8 days before.

But in her cosmetics bag there was a wedding ring which she did not declare. After that the visitor gave an assurance that she did not have any other gold objects. But another wedding ring and two rings turned up in a gallipot with pills and in a bottle of shampoo, and $220 and 800 hungarian forints, rolled into thin tubes, were in secret corners of her handbag.

The tourist did not say very much by way of explanation. She said, in particular, that the jewels were gifts from her relatives, and she had hidden them because she "knew that they would not pass through."

But she had to explain herself in more detail for another reason: a small videocassette, not marked in the customs declaration either, turned up in the double bottom of a bag. Kolomiyets explained that on this she had recorded a conversation with her acquaintances in Lvov, "Mr Slavko" and "Mr Myron." She allegedly did not know

either their second names or addresses, and she had received their telephone numbers from a New York acquaintance, Maria Holynenko. The recorded conversation dealt with changes in the USSR, glasnost, and the millenium of Christianity in the Ukraine. Before departure, she had hidden the cassette, because in this case too she was afraid it would be "taken away." About herself, Kolomiyets wrote very briefly: a journalist under contract with the journals MITIN (NEWS) and NEW YORK CITY TRIBUNE.

Indeed, the smuggler, caught red-handed, was chary of words, and the more so of frankness. But the very same cassette spoke for her, and also clearly indicated the main objective of her trip to Lvov. It was sufficient to turn on a videotape player to see two elderly men on the screen.

Their names were Vyacheslav Chornovol and Mykhaylo Horyn. Here are only a few excerpts from what they said, in well-modulated voices:

"The emigres' support for our efforts here is perhaps not a task of minor importance, as some people think over there, but probably one of the most important tasks of emigration."

"At one time we welcomed the creation of an organization such as WCFU—the 'World Congress of Free Ukrainians'—which had set itself the goal of eliminating differences... and of rallying together everyone, except that tiny part which assumed the name of 'progressive emigration.'

"We were told repeatedly that 'you are a tool in the hands of bourgeois propaganda, the CIA,' and so forth... I do not believe that the CIA has anything to do with emigres and their publications. But even if this is so, I am thankful to the CIA for having offered me a platform to address my compatriots in the Ukraine and abroad..." [passage omitted]

The interview lasted nearly an hour and touched upon various problems. But if anyone synthesizes this message to the "adherents" abroad, the essence of it comes to one thing: to create, at any price, the semblance that organized opposition allegedly exists in the Ukraine, an opposition with Chornovol and Horyn, of course, among its self-styled leaders. [pasage omitted]

True enough, contacts with nationalist emigrants have produced not only moral dividends for them. In particular, it was not mere chance that Martha Kolomiyets spent most of the U.S. $9,600 which she had brought in precisely in Lvov. There she bought a "VAZ-2106" automobile which she "presented" to a local resident, Z. Krasivskyy. It is easy to find out the real destination of the "present" if one keeps in mind the fact that Krasivskyy is Chornovol's confidante and a kind of personal chauffeur. As a matter of fact, it was he who asked for Kolomiyets in the hotel "Dnister" and who took her to the apartment in which the interview took place. Among the objects purchased by the American visitor in a Lvov foreign-currency store there were four "Panasonic" tape recorders, and a great deal of clothing and footwear. The wives of Chornovol and Horyn own most of these things.

In the country from which Kolomiyets came, people count their money and do not pay for nothing. This was again also realized by both her new acquaintances. In the videorecorded interview there are quite a few blank spots, without any picture or sound. This is not a technical defect; later on, the American visitor prudently erased the frames in which she instructed her interlocutors what they had to say and how. Indeed, he who pays, also calls the tune. But Chornovol and Horyn remain unperturbed. Sentenced at one time for state crimes and freed ahead of time for humane reasons, judging from everything they have again set about their old ways.

Certainly, "Mr Slavko" and "Mr Myron" may regard the aforesaid presents as a fee for the interview they gave, so to say, to boost their own reputation, although the cassette with their highly eloquent interview was hidden in Kolomiyets' luggage under a double bottom and has the status of commonplace contraband. As far as the fee is concerned, since biblical times payments for services of this kind have been called by somewhat different names...

Reappraisal of Bukharin Role Demanded

PM151347 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 49, 6 Dec 87 p 12

[Lev Voskresenskiy "Profile" article: "You Should Know, Comrades..."]

[Text] I've always wondered what urged Pasternak to write in his series - Volny (Waves) - published in 1931, the lines: "You're next to us, the far-off realm of socialism.... You, the country outside of hearsay and slander, are finding your way through the smoke of theories.... Where I don't get change from life, but where I mean only what I spend - and I spend everything I know." I was simply stunned when I learned whom these most wonderful lines were dedicated to. Pasternak - a non-party member, a man generally believed to be slightly "funny in the head", who didn't care to notice Stalin in his poetry, in spite of obvious "desires voiced at the top" - dedicated his Volny to another outstanding Party worker, statesman, a politician to the tip of his fingers, so to speak, a Bolshevik since 1906, member of the Central Committee after February 1917, editor of the main Party paper and at different times - member of the Politbureau, of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR, and of the Presidium of the Communist International. When dark clouds began to gather round the head of this man, Boris Pasternak deemed it his duty to send him a telegram (a letter according to other sources), expressing sympathy, support and confidence in the man's honesty.

It was rather hard to mail such a note openly in the 30s. Such a gesture, of course, speaks volumes about Pasternak himself and about Nikolay Ivanovich Bukharin, his addressee.

After all, a poet is a poet, a person swamped in emotions. But let's think about the price of every minute for Lenin in the short December days of 1922, when Lenin was lying in bed mortally ill, about the price of each word in his political will - which had been dictated with great difficulty and thoroughly appraised - about his nearest comrades-in-arms and inheritors of his cause. It would seem he had to write only about business and political characteristics, without any "emotions", because there wasn't time for them. Suddenly we come across the humanly warm, cordial words: "Bukharin is not only one of the most valuable and major theoreticians of the Party, but is also correctly considered the entire Party's favourite." The will did contain criticisms, too (we'll speak of them later on). But still: "The Party's favourite".

Nikolay Bukharin's important role in the ideological routing of Trotskiyism, the same as his errors at the very end of the 20s (which both he and his followers soon recognized), were mentioned for the first time in 50 years at the recent October Revolution celebrations, in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech. The Central Committee Politburo has set up a commission for a comprehensive investigation of the new and the previously known facts and papers that belong to the abuses committed in Stalin's time. The question of the trial of Nikolay Bukharin and his Party rehabilitation will be considered. No one can run ahead of time and forecast the ultimate verdict.

However, there is also the other side of the matter - the judgement of a person's personality. It cannot be either too early, or, on the other hand - too late, because both a personality and what people say about him or her - are outside time limits. We are talking about Bukharin even now and always did.

Once, not so long after the war,I got hold of a file of the OGONEK magazine for the 20s. I can still see the photo of the time.- Bukharin is writing - "I'll stop smoking!" - on a pack of cigarettes, promising this to the Young Pioneers crowded around him. Like it or not, this was how children got their first impression, however naive it could be, of the man's personality.

I remember a story told by my father about the 20s - the time of his youth:

"I came across Bukharin, face-to-face, in Nikitskaya Street, right opposite the Zoological Museum. He wore jackboots and wore a leather worker's jacket, flung open. He walked very swiftly, nearly running - the member of the Politburo and editor-in-chief of PRAVDA was hurrying - to read a lecture to students of Moscow University. I, naturally, followed him. When Bukharin reached the Kommunisticheskaya auditorium, he quickly took off his jacket and hung it on the back of a chair and came up to the lectern. The students welcomed him with extreme emotion."

Quite a few years later I was introduced to Anna Mikhaylovna Larina, Bukharin's widow, and Yuniy Larin, their son, who is an artist.

One feels strange at their home in Krzhizhanovskiy Street, not far from the Profsoyuznaya Metro Station. When listening to Anna Mikhaylovna's narration, time seems to get denser and one imagines the events of nearly half a century ago, as if they happened only yesterday: "... I came down - Stalin had come to see Nikolay Ivanovich and they were having tea.... Outwardly, I'd say, their relations were friendly. Stalin invited him often to his dacha. Stalin also insisted that we move from the Metropol hotel to live in the Kremlin... Ordzhonikidze was our nextdoor neighbour."

I looked at the photo on the wall - a steep, high brow, bright and glistening eyes, an open, friendly and a slightly scoffing look, and kind furrows above the lips. For some reason I'd imagined him to have been a big, tall and well-proportioned man, but in real life he was short, red-haired and as quick as quicksilver. He used to occupy high Party and government posts and being, as it was said then, one of the leaders, he remained an accessible, lively, merry, very sincere person who got easily carried away.

On the opposite wall are two oil landscapes—two works by Bukharin which miraculously survived to our time.

He exuded a current of some kind, or as we say now—he generated a biological field, and whoever got into that field, felt involuntarily its impact. Here is another colourful psychological episode.

Try to imagine the extremely hard spring of 1920s. The country's economy was paralyzed and famine was looming large. Wrangel's army was pressing all the time. And it was exactly in those days (probably at nights) that Lenin was reading the then just published book "Economy of the Transition Period (The General Theory of the Transformation Period, Part 1)," and, after reading it, wrote a joking review of it, making a parody, on purpose, of the author's overheavy style.

Today one regards this as a surprise which doesn't fit in with the textbook image of Lenin. What do you mean—a parody? And, moreover, at the time when there was hardly any excuse for joking. Lenin's review has been published many times and one can read it, but not the book "Economy of the Transition Period" by Bukharin. And, really, it should be read. Let's say, for example, that nowadays we're used to talking about the construction of socialism. But in the political vocabulary of the revolutionary time these words sounded crude. Words like—introducing, establishing or victory of socialism were

used more often. Bukharin was well-nigh the first person to realize this and wrote: "It will be necessary to build socialism. The existing objective and personal resources are only a point of departure in development which will engulf an entire huge epoch." "Quite right!" Lenin wrote in the margins. Lenin's own copy of the book, which is so carefully preserved at the Marx-Lenin Institute, has all its margins covered by his comments—Lenin sometimes argued with the author, sometimes finalized him but mainly his comments were—"Correct!" "Very good!" "Sehr gut!", "C'est le mot!" "Exactly!" and "This chapter is splendid!"

No, it was not by chance that in those most intense days of 1920, Lenin deemed it necessary to find time to read Bukharin's book with such great attention. After having a laugh at the book's heavy style, Lenin suddenly dropped the tone of friendly parody and said in all seriousness: "One would like to express the hope that this small shortcoming would disappear in the future editions, which are needed so much by our reading public."

Let us go back to Lenin's critical comment on Bukharin in the already cited "Letter to the Congress": "...But his theoretical views can be called Marxist with very great doubts, because he has something scholastic (he never studied and never understood dialectics to the end)."

And, true enough, he studied very little, if, of course, we understnad studies as a well-planned course of academic studies. In 1907 he joined the economic department of the Law Faculty of Moscow University. He was by that time a Bolshevik organizer, propagandist and agitator in Khamovniki, and 18 months later he was arrested, together with the other members of the Moscow Party Committee. During his four "university" years he was arrested three times, sent to Sushchevskaya and Butyrskaya jails, exiled to Onega, escaped and illegally went abroad.

A thriller film could have well been made about his six years abroad. In Austria he was arrested and put in a military fort. Later he was arrested in Britain and in Sweden. He was exiled to Norway, and managed to get with great difficulty to the USA where he made a lecture tour. As soon as he heard about the overthrow of the tsar, Bukharin hastened to get back home (through Japan, making a round-the-world trip) and became, as we can read in the first edition of the Big Soviet Encyclopaedia "One of the leading participants in the October Revolution".

But that's only the outside contour of his life. He also worked intensely in libraries and spent long hours thinking. In Vienna Bukharin listened to lectures by Bochin-Bawerk "himself", a universally recognized (to this day) patriarch of anti-Marxists, so as to be able, later on, to carry on polemics with him, the same as with Oppenheimer, Struve and Tugan-Baranovskiy. At the same time he carried on a theoretical, political and organizational struggle against the Trotskiyites, defencists and Mensheviks and worked in the Bolshevik press abroad. His research papers were published on after another.

Yes, they did contain "something scholastic". But let us look at an important postulate made by Lenin in the same "Letter to the Congress"—his criticism of Bukharin and Payatakov was made "only for the present". And Lenin stressed that this would remain correct only if both these "outstanding and loyal workers did not find the opportunity to increase their knowledge and change their unilateralisms". (25.12.22)

How old was Bukharin in December 1922? On October 10 he was only 34. He was still to write books and articles, to fight the Trotskiyites for a consistent fulfilment of the New Economic Policy, and to be elected an Academician of the Academy of Sciences. He was still to make his famous speech at the 1st Writers' Congress, write his antifascist articles and the words "socialist humanism" which later on became standard. And he was still to work energetically in the commission on the elaboration of the so-called Stalin Constitution.

On the eve of the February-March 1937 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, he realized that he wouldn't be free for very long.

"Since he couldn't justify himself in his lifetime," Anna Larina recollects, "Nikolay Ivanovich wrote a letter a day or two before his arrest. We expected a search. Fearing that the letter would be discovered, he asked me to learn it by heart. When he was convinced that I remembered the letter by heart, he destroyed the written text. I've been repeating these words like a prayer, throughout the years in jail and in exile:

"'I'm leaving life. I bow my head not before the proletarian sword, which should be merciless and also chaste. I feel my helplessness before the infernal machine which, using probably medieval methods, possesses a gigantic strength, fabricating organized slander, and acts boldly and confidently. Dzevshinskiy is no more. The wonderful traditions of the Cheka - when the revolutionary idea governed all of its activities, justified its cruelty to enemies, and preserved the state from all and every counterrevolution - have gradually become a thing of the past. It was because of these traditions that Cheka organs merited a special confidence, a special honour, prestige and respect.'"

How many time must Anna Larina have repeated these words. Recording them, I had a strange fear in case the tape broke.

"...Any member of the Central Committee, any Party member...can be reduced to nil, made a traitor, terrorist, saboteur or a spy. Stalin would doubt himself - the confirmation would have come at once.

"Storm clouds loom large over the Party. My single, absolutely innocent head will pull after it thousands of innocents. Because an organization - a Bukharin's organization - must be created, even though it does not exist now, when I've not a shadow of a difference with the Party for the seventh year now, but which was nonexistent then, at the time of the right opposition. I knew nothing about Ryutin's and Uglanov's secret organizations. Together with Rykov and Tomskiy, I've expounded my views openly.

"I've been a Party member since I was 18, and the goal of my life was always the struggle for the interests of the working class, for the victory of socialism. These days the newspaper with the holy name PRAVDA is printing the most heinous lies - that purportedly I, Nikolay Bukharin, wanted to destroy the gains of the October Revolution and to restore capitalism. This is unprecedented brazenness, it is a lie. Such brazenness and irresponsibility to the people could only be matched by the next lie: 'As it has turned out, Nikolay Romanov spent his entire life in a struggle against capitalism and monarchy, for the fulfilment of a proletarian revolution.'

"If in the methods of socialist construction I've been mistaken many times, let our descendants not judge me more strictly than Lenin did. We moved to one goal for the first time, by the untrodden path. The time and the mores were different. PRAVDA used to carry a 'discussion column' everybody argued, made up and went on further, together.

"Addressing you, the future generation of Party leaders, whose historic mission is the obligation to unravel the terrible mess of crimes which are becoming, in these terrible days, ever greater, are gathering strength and are suffocating the Party. I address all Party members. In these, which are maybe the last days of my life, I'm sure that sooner or later the filter of history will inevitably wash the dirt off my head. I've never been a traitor. I'd give up my life without a second thought for Lenin. I was fond of Kirov and I haven't schemed in any way against Stalin.

"You should know, comrades, that there is also my drop of blood on the banner which you will carry on your triumphant march to communism. N. Bukharin"

He went off to the session of the Plenary Meeting and didn't come home. It happened on February 27. Anna Mikhalovna was arrested soon afterwards. Yuriy, who at the time wasn't even 12 months old, ended up in an orphanage.

The verdict was read out on March 13, 1938. It is one of the verdicts which should be appealed against.

Volkogonov Examines the 'Stalin Phenomenon'

PM111500 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 9 Dec 87 p 13

[Dmitriy Volkogonov article: "The Stalin Phenomenon"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The genre of political biography is clearly out of favor in our literature. To this day we have no serious biographical study of Stalin. But the need for such a work is beyond doubt. For a long time now Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Professor D.A. Volkogonov has been working on materials for a biography of Stalin. He is well known in the academic world as author of nearly a score of monographs on military theory and political questions. At the same time his pen is also responsible for a number of books in the genre of philosophical current affairs writing. We offer for the attention of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA readers an abridged version of the author's foreword to the book "Triumph and Tragedy" (A Political Portrait of I.V. Stalin) ["Triumf i Tragediya" (Politicheskiy Portret I.V. Stalina)], which D.A. Volkogonov intends to complete next year.

Only he himself knew everything about himself. Stalin did not like grays: either black, or white. He was undoubtedly concerned that bright colors should predominate in his biography for his descendants. I do not know whether he had any inkling of the existence in Ancient Rome of the "Law of Condemnation of Memory," whereby everything that was not to the liking of the current emperor had to be consigned to oblivion. But we know that this law only emphasized the futility of attempts to regulate human memory. Memory lives (or dies) by very different laws, laws of its own. History is a bottomless pit. But not everything "slips" through the holes in the giant net of memory that stretches over the abyss of oblivion. Big lumps like Stalin have a chance of remaining in the annals of history.

All of us cannot fail to rejoice that an active process is now taking place not only of renewal of the present, but also of "restoration" of the past. And probably the intellectual and emotional epicenter of public interest in the past is the figure of Stalin. I do not think there has been any more contradictory figure in our history (Russian or Soviet). The praise and abuse that have fallen to his lot are enough for a whole legion of historical personalities.

Traveling into the future is a difficult, rocky journey. Traveling into the past is no easier. It always, as Feuerbach so aptly put it, "pierces the heart," it is moving and disturbing. Stalin is one of the most complex personalities in history. Such people, whether we like it or not, belong not only to the past, but also to the present and future. Their lives are eternal philosophical "food" for thought about life, times, and conscience. One conclusion that becomes apparent as soon as you start studying Stalin is that the history of that individual is a crystallization of the highly complex dialectics of his age. To the

extent to which the conditions of the times were complex, the personality at the head of the people and party was equally complex. If we are honest before the truth, honest before history, we cannot but admit I.V. Stalin's indisputable contribution to the struggle for socialism and its defense, as well as his unforgivable political errors and crimes, which took the form of unjustified repressions of many thousands of innocent people. Stalin and the leading nucleus of the party, upholding and defending Leninism in the political and ideological struggle, created favorable conditions for accelerated socialist building. When it seemed that the most difficult time (in terms of the intraparty struggle) was behind and major successes were in evidence in many spheres of new, creative work, a profoundly erroneous political thesis was born, "consecrated" by Stalin, on the exacerbation of the class struggle as forward movement takes place. That meant that the dictatorship of the proletariat for the common cause turned increasingly toward not the constructive, but the punitive side. It is therefore no accident that assessments of Stalin's personality underwent radical changes as the real historical truth emerged. If you compare, for instance, the Greetings of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on Stalin's 70th birthday in 1949 with the provisions of N.S. Khrushchev's dramatic report delivered at the 20th CPSU Congress on the night of 24 February 1956, the assessments of the party leader are practically at opposite poles. Only a few years lie between these assessments, which were made, basically, by the very same people. Then the process of public enlightenment entered a kind of moratorium phase.

When the name of Stalin is pronounced, what springs to many people's minds first of all is the tragic year 1937, repressions, and the violation of humanity. Invisible Valkyries sprang into being in the atmosphere of society, and they, it is well-known, have the power of life and death over people. Yes, all this happened. There is no forgiveness for those guilty of these crimes. But we remember that during those same years Dneproges and Magnitka sprang up, there were Papanin, Angelina, Stakhanov, Busygin... In those years the foundations of all that we build on today were created: Those were the times of the supreme flight of the human spirit in the Soviet people who stood firm and conquered fascism in the Great Patriotic War. It is therefore erroneous from a political viewpoint and morally dishonest, in condemning Stalin for his crimes, to call into question the real achievements of socialism and its basic potential. It is wrong, when assessing Stalin or the people in his immediate entourage, mechanically to transfer these assessments to the party and to the millions of ordinary people whose faith in the rightness of revolutionary ideals was not shaken.

The old Bolshevik A.I. Kuptsov, who carried his tragic cross through many camps, through inhuman humiliations and trials, says firmly today, decades after his experiences: "There were many of us in the camps who were there because of tyranny. But never once, and I want to repeat that especially, never once did it even occur to me to suspect that our ideas, our system, our ideals were flawed. The monstrous injustice was associated solely with tragic mistakes of some kind, errors by specific individuals. All my comrades in misfortune thought the same. We rejoiced sincerely in the reports from outside about the startup of new plants and Chkalov's flights, and then we suffered over the stunning failures of the beginning of the war... Prison did not, could not detach us spiritually from the motherland, from the cause, to which we remained devoted even behind the barbed wire of the Siberian camps."

You cannot weigh up the past on the basis of arithmetic: Which did Stalin have more of—merits or crimes? The very formulation of this question is immoral, because no merits can justify inhumanity. The question is considerably more complex: You have to comprehend the origins, the causes of the deformation of the machinery of power. How could it happen that the great coexisted with the base, evil was camouflaged by good? Why did the social degeneration of many individuals take place? Was tragedy inevitable? Why did the institutions of social defense not "work"? These and many other questions are often raised in our press, reflecting the rapid rise in Soviet people's political and historical level of awareness which we have seen since the 27th party congress. In a number of cases, especially among young people who have only a sketchy knowledge of history, diametrically contradictory judgments and subjectivist assessments cause intellectual confusion capable of generating social nihilism and disrespect for our values. The best means of quenching the thirst for knowledge is to learn the truth.

The Leninist methodology of analysis of the October Socialist Revolution and its prospects and the assessment of the political and human qualities of its leaders—that is the starting point in creating a philosophical and political portrait. Stalin remembered all his life that V.I. Lenin, in his notes for the congress in December 1922, called him and Trotskiy "outstanding leaders," but he never forgot, either, the searingly frank and profound assessment of his complex nature, his difficult character. Nor could he tolerate the fact that Lenin called Bukharin the "darling of the whole party." A study of Stalin's statements shows that he repeatedly, but extremely cautiously, in a rhetorical and roundabout way, disputed Lenin's assessments. For instance, mentally polemicizing with Lenin, he said in one of his speeches: "We love Bukharin, but we love the truth, the party, the Comintern even more." That sentence contains practically the whole of Stalin: devoted to the idea, but cunning and subtle. Lenin's opinion that "Stalin is too rude" was interpreted by the general secretary in a speech as meaning that he is "rude only to enemies..." In turning to Lenin to analyze the Stalin phenomenon, you see again and again that Lenin's lightning thoughts are, as before, ahead of us. That is the quality not simply of wise, profound truths, but of prophetic truths.

Political biographies of many historical figures have been written in recent years: Caesar, Napoleon, Churchill, De Gaulle, and others who will never be swept under the carpet of history. We do not consider it shameful or inconvenient, for instance, to publish books even about such a sinister, inhuman individual as Hitler. But there is no biography of I.V. Stalin. Yet dozens of books have been written about him abroad. This gap is today being filled in our country by numerous artistic and historical publications about individual facets and aspects of the activity of this man. Their appearance has the effect of rain after a prolonged drought. There will undoubtedly be more serious studies by historians on Stalin, as well as Bukharin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and other party and state figures.

One reason for this interest is that Stalin's life ended, in historical terms, recently, less than 4 decades ago, and thus his fate is closely involved with the fates of people who are alive now and their immediate predecessors.

Another reason for the unremitting interest in chapters from Stalin's life is the new interpretation of social and general human values: socialism, humanism, justice, truth, moral ideals. The years of stagnation showed once again that dogmatic thought can only create an illusory philosophical temple in which everything has to play the role of the "eternal." But there is probably nothing eternal, except change. Dogmatic blindness is dangerous, it can turn ideology into religion. Dogmatism postpones all earthly joys to "tomorrow," and tomorrow to "the day after tomorrow." The phase of revolutionary renewal which our society has entered impinged first of all on public awareness. It is no accident that the main targets of criticism and rejection are dogmatism and bureaucracy, which have their roots in the years of Stalin's autocratic leadership.

Finally, there is another reason (there are, of course, others too) for the persistent interest in the life of the man who was for more than 30 years at the top of the pyramid of power. Not alongside people, like Lenin, not among them, like him, but standing above them. Soviet people, despite the innumerable eulogistic articles, portraits, and statues, and his works, knew practically nothing about Stalin. The short biography which came out after the war has no authors, but only, as the title page says, "compilers": G.F. Aleksandrov, M.B. Mitin, P.N. Pospelov, and others. The biography, which was edited personally by Stalin himself, outlines a man's heroic deeds, but the man himself is missing.

True, there were attempts by some of his contemporaries to write a political portrait. Thus Academician Ye.M. Yaroslavskiy published, before the war, the book "On Comrade Stalin" ["O Tovarishche Staline"], in which, along with unrestrained apologetics, he rightly noted that writing about Stalin means describing all the peripeteias of the party's struggle in the process of building socialism in our country. Karl Radek, in the book "Portraits and Pamphlets" ["Portrety i Pamflety"] (1933), devoted a long article to Stalin, written in the tone of unrestrained praise of the Messiah. The glorification of the leader, humiliating as it was for Radek, did not, incidentally, save the author of the "Portraits" from a sad fate. The academic value of such works is small.

A man's life burns itself out quickly, like a northern summer. Perhaps it also resembles a camp fire: sparks, bright, cheerful tongues of fire, a strong flame, a calm heat, a feeble flickering, glowing coals, cold ash... Nonexistence lies in store for any man, great or small, sooner or later. And that means eternal night which will certainly come; it means day that will never come again. This truth is merciless to everyone equally. Stalin realized that. It was not without Stalin's participation and the help of his comrades that our history includes not only many "blank" spaces, but also many places where pages of the annals are distorted or sometimes simply torn out. That is one difficulty.

There is another, more general difficulty. The fact is that the consciousness of a specific individual is a whole microcosm, a vast, enigmatic world which disappears with the individual's death. We will never learn everything about every individual who has departed this life, but the potential for such learning is boundless. Stalin's thoughts and ideas can be seen not so much in his works, records, and resolutions, as in actions given material form in social practice, achievements, deeds, and, to our grief, in his crimes. The mysteries of the consciousness in this sense are not such great mysteries after all, if we can see what they "feed on," how they are expressed and inspired. The world of human existence that surrounds us, that world of many colors, many tones, and much suffering, is the main key to penetrating the mysteries of a person's consciousness, including such a person as Stalin. Although sometimes the logic of scientific analysis of Stalin's deeds leads to an impasse when you try to clarify some of his actions.

Stalin knew, for instance, of Lenin's warm attitude to Bukharin. Stalin himself for many years maintained friendly personal relations with him and his family. Bukharin played a role of considerable importance in helping Stalin in the struggle against Trotskiy and Trotskiyism. Stalin could not help but see that accusations of, for instance, espionage, conspiracy, and so forth against Bukharin looked utterly risible. Bukharin, with his highly developed intellect, knew how to respect arguments. When he was convinced that his program of unhurried socialist development could lead to failure, because history had not allowed our country time for a "slow start," he honestly admitted his mistakes. And not merely admitted them, but became actively involved in the implementation of the party's instructions. But that did not prevent Stalin from sanctioning, in effect, reprisals against this most popular party figure, in effect a close party comrade... How can we explain or understand that?

A few years ago, while preparing to write a philosophical and biographical essay on I.V. Stalin, I found myself taking an interest in literature about Alexander the Great, Caesar, Cromwell, Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great... I was interested in the psychology of "great leaders," dictators, sovereigns, and other absolutist leaders. Although I realize that all historical analogies are risky here, I would like to express one preliminary opinion. People with unlimited power, outside democratic control, usually develop feelings of infallibility, unlimited personal superiority, and omnipotence, and exaggerated views of their own capabilities and potential. As a rule, these people, while living among people, are eternally alone. Although Stalin, as has been established, only very rarely talked with anyone one-on-one (he always had Molotov or Kaganovich, Voroshilov or Malenkov, Beria or someone else with him), he was eternally alone in his heart. He had nobody to relate to, nobody to discuss things with, nobody to prove things to, nobody to justify himself to... Loneliness at the top and the chilling reality of unlimited power dried up his feelings and turned his intellect into a cold calculating machine. Every step, instantly becoming "historic," "fateful," and "decisive," gradually kills the human being in the man...

He tried all his life (and not without success!) to turn one of his weaknesses into a sign of strength. Back in the times of the revolution, when he had to go to a plant, a regiment, a street rally, into the crowd, Stalin had a feeling of inner uncertainty and anxiety, which, true, he managed to conceal. Stalin did not like speaking before people, and indeed, perhaps he was unable to do it well. His speech was simple and clear, but without imaginative flights, aphorisms, or oratorical emotionalism. His strongly accented, constrained, monotonous speech made his pronouncements inexpressive. It was no accident that Stalin spoke at rallies, meetings, and demonstrations less than any other member of Lenin's entourage. He preferred to draw up directives and instructions, write articles and notes, and offer newspaper rejoinders on this or that political event. After his return from exile in mid-March 1917, for instance, Stalin published more than 60 articles and notes in the newspapers PRAVDA, SOLDATSKAYA PRAVDA, and RABOCHIY I SOLDAT and other publications, in only 6 months! He was a mediocre journalist from the viewpoint of literary style. But it cannot be denied that he showed consistency and accuracy, and his conclusions were invariably categorical. In Gori, where Stalin was born, the rays of the sun at noon fall almost sheer, leaving no shadows. So it is in his newspaper articles: There are no grays.

Later, Stalin was to become accustomed to platforms at congresses and conferences. But by then the situation was different: People would hear his quiet, calm voice in echoing silence, ready to interrupt it with a storm of applause, turning into an ovation. Stalin made a rule of his restrained attitude to direct contacts with the masses: He did not go, with rare exceptions, to plants, kolkhozes, the republics, the fronts. The voice of the leader rang out on rare occasions from the very top of the pyramid. At its foot, millions listened, quaking devoutly. The leader turned his unsociable and reserved nature into a cult attribute, an attribute of exclusivity.

I repeat, I am not a historian. I am sure more detailed historical works will appear. But as a philosopher, I have tried to adhere to the principle of historical and logical unity. The analysis and conclusions are based first and foremost on Lenin's works, party documents, and materials from various archives. For instance, when touching on the military side of activity, I studied many interesting, original, unpublished documents from the Defense Ministry archives. Even a first encounter with Stalin's decisions in military documents testifies to the exceptionally contradictory nature of their author. Here is an example. Stalin reads a report on how attempts to master night flight have caused numerous disasters in the air force. The report from the people's commissar for defense points out that the reason for the accidents is the air force leadership's encouragement of laxity and indiscipline. At that time, such an assessment was tantamount to a condemnation. Stalin decides: The pilots must be better taught, and the air force leader who is charged with "conniving with laxity" must be sent to study at the academy. Yet alongside this, in other documents, the decisions are very different, and cruel.

Looking at the well preserved lines of Stalin's resolutions, written, as a rule, in red or blue pencil, in a sweeping, legible hand, you think: What are the underlying reasons for the irrationality of this man? Do they perhaps lie in the dogmatic religious diet he was fed on abundantly in his early life? Or perhaps in a kind of intellectual jealously which he experienced listening at the party congresses in London and Stockholm to brilliant speeches by Lenin, Plekhanov, Akselrod, and Martov? Or does this irrationality have its origins in his embitteredness, which began even before October? In a letter of 30 December 1922 Lenin noted a trait of bitterness in Stalin's nature. That trait, Lenin wrote, "in general plays usually the very worst role in politics." There were seven arrests and five flights in his pre-October biography. From the age of 19 he was constantly going into hiding, carrying out the instructions of party committees, being arrested, changing his name, obtaining false passports, expropriating sums of money for party needs, moving from place to place... He could not be kept in prisons, he escaped and went into hiding again. But the idea of going abroad never occurred to him.

I read the works of Stalin's political and ideological opponents within the country: Trotskiy, Zinovyev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov, Tomskiy, and others. They were all both comrades in arms and pupils of Lenin. None of them considered himself a "protege" of Stalin, whereas, later, Kaganovich, Molotov, Voroshilov, and the other new figures who took their place spoke of themselves openly as such proteges. In this case Stalin

acted in accordance with the ancient law of dictators: The people they themselves have promoted are notable for their greater devotion, and do not lay claim to the prime roles. Trotskiy, Zinovyev, Kamenev, and a number of other figures in the twenties were better known to the party than Stalin. It must be said that some of them were very prolific: For instance, L. Trotskiy published 17 volumes of his own works in 1927. This politician, who was full of energy and was not without his share of literary talent, in creating his "works," invariably showed off before the mirror of history, trying to justify his claims to party leadership. On studying the volumes of his correspondence, I was struck by his concern about what would be handed down to later generations about him. Apologetic letters, notes delivered during his many speeches, lists of diplomats seeking an audience with him, press comment on his steps and actions—all this was carefully filed and preserved. Trotskiy was preparing to seize the leadership after Lenin's death.

Stalin was most frequently the direct or indirect target of Trotskiy's critical arrows. True, his main anti-Soviet, anti-Stalin literature was written after his exile from the USSR. Trotskiy's characterization of Stalin is well known: "our party's most outstanding mediocrity." But Trotskiy, who hardly bothered to conceal his opinion of himself as an intellectual genius, resorted frequently to such expressions, seeking to belittle his opponents (he spoke thus, for instance, of Zinovyev in 1924, calling him an "importunate mediocrity"; Vandervelde—a "brilliant mediocrity," and Tsereteli—a "talented and honest mediocrity," and so forth). After his exile from the country, until the end of his life, Trotskiy kept one eternal, maniacal passion: hatred for Stalin. Nobody in the world wrote as much caustic, spiteful, insulting, caricatured, humiliating stuff about Stalin as Trotskiy did. In this way he gave himself away even more: After all, he was fighting not for the truth, but only for himself, the dictator manque.

When the tragic day 21 January 1924 came, Stalin dictated a telegram with the following content: "To be conveyed to Comrade Trotskiy. Comrade Lenin died suddenly at 0650 on 21 January. Death followed paralysis of the respiratory center. Funeral Saturday 26 January. Stalin." Signing the dispatch, Stalin realized that now he had to face a tough, merciless struggle with Trotskiy for the leadership. But did Stalin know that when he overcame Trotskiy, he still would not have "got rid" of him, although he himself would not suspect it? The methods of the bureaucratic decree style, violence, "turning the screw," of which Trotskiy was the apologist, were adopted by Stalin. Was not this one of the sources of the tragedy to come? And what were the others? I will mention only this.

There is a reason of, so to speak, a private nature. After the 11th party congress, at the 3 April 1922 Central Committee plenum, the post of general secretary was instituted. At that time this post was not regarded as the main, key post, or else the first general secretary would, evidently, have been Lenin. The general secretary had to conduct the current work of the Secretariat. Lenin was already sick. Following Kamenev's recommendation (and, obviously, with Lenin's approval), Stalin was appointed to this post, having demonstrated his inclination for apparatus work even earlier. And less than a year after the appointment, on 4 January 1923, in his appendix to the "Letter to the Congress," Lenin proposed to the comrades in the Central Committee that they "consider a means" of removing Stalin from that post. It took Vladimir Ilich only a few months to study the man in the post of general secretary and see in him something that could become dangerous in future. The leader's death prevented the implementation of this intention. But another, special reason arises from this: the nonfulfillment of Lenin's will. The members of the Central Committee and delegates to the 13th congress were inconsistent on this question. The concession to Stalin by the well-wishing (at that time!) Zinovyev and Kamenev cost the party dear in future. Although Stalin, learning of Lenin's letter, even, by some accounts, tried to resign. For the sake of objectivity it should be said that in 1924 Stalin was only one of many leaders, and nobody saw him as a future demon.

However, the main reason for the future tragedies lies elsewhere. It, too, lies in the sphere of Lenin's instructions which were not fulfilled by his heirs. In his last letters (and all this in the unique volume 45!) the leader returns repeatedly to the idea of democratizing the party's life, improving the apparatus' work, swelling the composition of the Central Committee from among the workers and peasants, and systematically renewing it. Unfortunately, the democratic foundations were merely laid, and not developed. After all, if Stalin's tenure of the newly instituted post had been limited to a specified term, the cult deformation might have been prevented. In Lenin's proposal to the 12th party congress, "How We Should Reorganize the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate," we can glimpse the idea of a necessary renewal of leading party organs and the delimitation of the functions of the Central Committee and the Soviet power. The first shoots of democracy were not tended. They were gradually stifled by the stronger growths of dogmatism, bureaucracy, and administrative management. The future cult of the "great leader" was no mere accident.

I have managed to obtain the testimonies of many people who met with Stalin or fell to some extent into the whirlpool of events caused by his decisions. Even individual notes from the general chorus of history are important. Thanks to them, it becomes possible to gain a more profound sense of historical retrospective, hear the voices of the departed, and understand better the reasons for the seething passions... Echoes of history... They live in us, in our lives and memories, and sometimes in meager new information from what is past, burned out, and hidden. These are like little pieces of news from a past which is reluctant to sink forever into the unknown, disappear into the remoteness of eternity. It is, perhaps, possible even to speak of the unfinished past; in other

words, of an element, a phenomenon of time to which there is as yet no reliable, complete answer. Thus, for instance, deep down, I do not consider the past finished for myself: Knowing that my father was repressed in 1937, I do not know where he is buried, what were his last thoughts and words... Most likely I will never know, but my mind is reluctant to be reconciled to this. An unfinished past can also exist for a people who do not fully know the true history of their triumphs and tragedies.

In history, one man's triumph has often resulted in tragedy for a whole people. N.S. Khrushchev, delivering the report at the 20th party congress, placed the emphasis thus: "We cannot say," he noted, "that his actions were the actions of a mad despot. He believed that it was necessary to act in that way in the interests of the party and the working people's masses, for the sake of the defense of revolutionary gains. Therein lies the tragedy!" I do not think the emphasis is quite right. M.S. Gorbachev's report of 2 November 1987 says that the documents which exist allow us to assume that Stalin knew of the scale of the repressions and their mass nature. Yes, he knew, and knew precisely. For instance, V.V. Ulrikh, deputy chairman of the Supreme Court, regularly, with Vyshinskiy, reported to Stalin (and usually to Molotov and Yezhov at the same time) on the trials and verdicts. In 1937 Ulrikh submitted a "report" every month on the total number of people convicted of "espionage, terrorist, and subversive activity." Stalin read all the reports: on the harvest, the quantity of coal extracted, and, terrible to say, the number of people deprived of their lives.

Stalin rapidly grew accustomed to violence as a necessary attribute of unlimited power. Most likely—but this is derived from logical assumptions—the punitive machine, set in full motion by Stalin, seized the imagination not only of low-level functionaries, but of Stalin himself. Perhaps the downward progress toward the idea of violence as a universal solution evolved in a number of stages. First, the struggle against real enemies, and they did exist; then, the elimination of personal adversaries; after that, the terrible inertia of violence was already in force; finally, violence began to be regarded as an indicator of devotion and orthodoxy. For instance, even his closest aides Molotov and Kaganovich greeted without a murmur the reports that the former's wife and the latter's brother had been arrested as "enemies of the people."

Sometimes Stalin looked on society as a human zoo: Everything was in his power... "Sabotage," spy mania, and tilting at the windmills of "double dealing" became the shameful attributes of orthodoxy, blind faith, and devotion to the leader. For instance, it could hardly even be imagined that of the Politburo members and candidate members elected at the 14th All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress, six would turn out to be enemies! Stalin destroyed the "enemies," but the waves spread further and further... It was a tragic triumph for the force of evil. And who knows: Was there not, alongside the cruelty, a mental illness in Stalin that was never recognized? Otherwise it is hard to explain why, after eliminating his rivals, he needed to continue to "cut down" the best people in the party and state on the eve of terrible trials. Incidentally, within the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] organs themselves, very many Bolsheviks saw, earlier than others, the danger of hysterical universal suspicion and repressions. Among them alone, more than 20,000 honest people fell victims to this orgy of lawlessness.

However, no scowls on the face of history could ultimately take away the achievements of the people who created the "first land of socialism," and despite the tragedy, we preserved our devotion to our ideals. The dialectics of triumph and tragedy themselves contain the eternal complexity of our life, in which, while the decisive role belongs (ultimately!) to the people's masses, so much depends on historical individuals. As Hegel said, a man's destiny is not his alone, it represents the general moral, tragic destiny. And the tragedy lay precisely in the fact that at a certain stage Stalin was perceived by millions of people not as a man of flesh and blood, but as a symbol of socialism, its living personification. After all, a lie repeated many times can look like the truth. The deification of the leader took on the highest meaning, it justified any negative phenomena, in people's eyes, as being the result of intrigues by "enemies," and, conversely, it attributed every success to the mind and will of one man alone. In adopting and promulgating this or that decision, especially at large forums, Stalin liked to quote the classics. Here he showed a common human weakness. People like to have patrons. Even such a powerful man as Stalin was not averse to hiding in the shadow of the authority of a theory, ideological cliches, his great predecessor. Triumph and tragedy were expressed in Soviet people's high patriotism and internationalism, and at the same time in the dogmatism and bureaucracy of many institutions; in the genuine devotion and heroism of the millions, and the omnipotence of the apparatus and the imposition of the "cog" mentality.

The simplest thing is to say that every age has its "middle ages." I am profoundly convinced that if there had not been a shortage of people's power after Lenin's death, the socialist development of society could have got away without those deep dents in the shield of the fatherland's history that arose contrary to the high ideals of Marxism. Tragedy was not inevitable. Of course, it is easier to talk about the possible alternative today than it was to make the choice in those now distant years. Analyzing the circumstances is easy. Coping with them is always harder.

Looking back from the heights of the present, it seems that after the death of Lenin, whom even the party's oppositionists admired, Trotskiy and Bukharin had a real chance of becoming head of the party. Today it can be affirmed that if Trotskiy had taken the helm of the party, even graver trials would have lain in store for it,

trials fraught with the danger of the loss of socialist gains. Especially since Trotskiy did not have a clear, scientific program for building socialism in the USSR. Bukharin did have such a program, he had his vision of partywide goals. But Bukharin, for all his attractiveness as a personality, his lofty intellect, gentleness, and humanity, for a long time failed to recognize the historical necessity for the country to put on a rapid spurt in the buildup of economic might.

Of course, there were also Rudzutak, Frunze, Rykov... But it seems that after Lenin's death and almost until the beginning of the thirties, among the leaders of the revolution Stalin was probably the most consistent and strong-willed defender of the party's course of founding and strengthening the world's first socialist state. True, he did not have the qualities to replace Lenin. Nobody did. Of course, Stalin did not have Lenin's brilliant spiritual might, Plekhanov's theoretical profundity, or Lunacharskiy's culture. He was neither a major theorist, nor an orator, nor an attractive personality. Intellectually and morally he was inferior to many. And he became first?! In the time of struggle for the survival of the new system, the leader's purposefulness and political will were exceptionally significant. And here, perhaps, Stalin had, after Lenin, no equals. In the words of Shakespeare's Hamlet, "with all his imperfections on his head," he still had something that others did not have. Not the least important role here was played by Stalin's ability to make maximum use of the party apparatus to achieve his goals. And many of those who remained alongside Stalin after Lenin's death were not up to the task. In these conditions the alternative of other leaders was unlikely.

But ultimately it is not a matter of personalities, but above all of the fact that the democratic potential which Lenin had begun to create was not preserved. That is the whole point. If the democratic attributes of social protection against chance phenomena had been created, it would not have mattered crucially whether the leader was outstanding or less outstanding. Otherwise, the country's fate becomes excessively dependent on the historical choice: Who is at the helm of power. Stalin, who did much to establish socialism in our country and never so much as veered in the direction of any opposition, did not, however, withstand the test of power. First and foremost from the viewpoint of his attitude toward common human moral values. Stalin was not simply merciless toward political adversaries. He regarded any other viewpoint as opportunist. He who was not with him, was regarded as an enemy. For Stalin, the idea of duty, which he interpreted as an expression of unfailing fulfillment of instructions, prevailed over the idea of human rights.

To outlive one's times is given only to a few. One such is Stalin. But his immortality is troubled. It will be a long time before the disputes die down about his role in our history, disputes accompanied by epithets tinged with reverence, hatred, bitterness, and eternal perplexity. One way or another, we are still learning, from Stalin's life, that the power of great ideas is ultimately stronger than the power of men, and the tragic catalog of Stalin's abuses could not, of course, undermine the tremendous attractive force of the ideals put forward by the leading lights of Marxism.

The judgment of men can be illusory. The judgment of history is eternal.

OGONEK Editor Comments on Reforms, Yeltsin

PM171309 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 11 Dec 87 p 5

[Interview with OGONEK chief editor Vitaliy Korotich by Laura Starink: "Soviet Chief Editor: Fighting Against Fat Cats"]

[Text] Washington, 10 Dec—In the last few days no Russian has passed unnoticed in the square kilometer between the White House and the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Reporters in search of news even followed the members of the Soviet delegation on shopping errands and asked purchasers importunate questions about their buying habits. Even in the two hotels where the Russian guests are staying many a journalist was looking for a quote, a wisecrack, or a profound comment.

Vitaliy Korotich, chief editor of the popular weekly OGONEK (print run: 1.5 million copies), is one of them. He is in Washington because of the summit, but has his own timetable. He said that he is here to negotiate with a U.S. publisher who wants to publish an English edition of OGONEK. "I am also looking for foreign columnists and writers for my weekly."

In the Soviet Union OGONEK is seen as a publication that very strongly supports Gorbachev's reform policy. Recently it published a remarkable interview with the widow of Nikolay Bukharin, the revolutionary executed in 1938 after a show trial. In his 2 November speech at the celebrations to mark the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution Gorbachev did mention Bukharin, but it did not amount (yet) to a rehabilitation, as the widow had been hoping. Korotich: "I asked no one for permission for the publication of that interview. I based my action exclusively on Gorbachev's evaluation of Bukharin in his 2 November speech."

[Starink] Why?

[Korotich] Gorbachev indicated in his speech that Bukharin had not done anything for which he deserved to be executed. That was enough for me.

[Starink] But you must have known that already?

[Korotich] In party matters we need Gorbachev's permission. Bukharin was a member of the Politburo. If he made mistakes, the party must pass judgment.

[Starink] Does publication mean that the decision to rehabilitate Bukharin has already been made?

[Korotich] I do not know. The documents about his case are in the party archive. The decision about rehabilitation must come from the party. Our most important problem is that we do not have any normal historiography. All stories and personal ups and downs have to be forged into one history. That is why I published the interview. [Korotich ends]

A month ago Gorbachev dismissed the secretary of the Moscow party, Boris Yeltsin, one of the most powerful supporters of his reform program. Yeltsin had complained about the slow pace of restructuring and was subsequently the target of a nasty attack at a meeting of the Moscow party committee and accused of "political adventurism" and "an overdose of ambition." Although the whole of Moscow was shocked by the way in which Yeltsin was moved aside, open protests did not materialize. There was an atmosphere of anxious expectancy and there were fears for the continuation of restructuring.

[Starink] What did you think of the Yeltsin affair?

[Korotich] Perhaps this sounds cynical, but Yeltsin's life is not mine. He was far from the intellectuals and sought no contact with us. He was a man who did not shirk his work, but in the long run he was unable to give the Muscovites anything. In every democratic state the people at the top change. Under Stalin he would have been executed, under Khrushchev he would have been punished, but now he has simply been removed from his post. I think that is democratic. Perhaps Yeltsin really was an adventurer.

[Starink] But what do you think of, to put it mildly, the indelicate way in which the matter was dealt with in the press? The statements on the basis of which Yeltsin was dismissed have not been published, only his public condemnation and self-criticism.

[Korotich] The speeches at party plenums are never published and no reporters are admitted. The party must be able to meet behind closed doors.

[Starink] If you were to get hold of a text of Yeltsin's speech would you publish it?

[Korotich] If there were a text, it could only be made public through the party committee. I might perhaps print an eyewitness account, but really, the Yeltsin affair is not that important.

[Starink] But in Moscow in the days after the row you could feel how people retreated in fear.

[Korotich] There is a lot of fear in our society, that is the price we are paying for our past. We have to knock the fear out of people and create more laws and guarantees against the abuse of power.

[Starink] What dangers threaten Gorbachev's reform policy?

[Korotich] The most important difference between us and the West is that we have no political experience. Some people are convinced that the Soviet Union can survive in a democracy, but according to others it would then become a brothel, and we would go under with this democracy.

[Starink] Isn't the most important threat to restructuring the fact that for the time being people are not seeing any results?

[Korotich] You cannot conjure sausages up out of nothing overnight. We must not count on economic improvements in the next 4 years. We are on the floor of a valley. Glasnost is not the road to an immediate supply of sausages, but to a change of mentality. People have to learn to think for themselves and to make decisions.

[Starink] Is the process irreversible, as Gorbachev says?

[Korotich] Glasnost can no longer be stopped. People know too much. OGONEK has won more than half a million new subscribers this year. Our opponents are the real enemies of the system.

[Starink] But all this has been said before.

[Korotich] The political liberalization under Khrushchev was at a different level. Then we were fighting against the Stalinist bureaucracy. That consisted of hard people firmly convinced that they were right. Now we are fighting against the fat cats who are used to sitting still on their chairs and doing nothing.

NOVYY MIR To Continue Publishing 'Shelved' Works

PM151335 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 49, 6 Dec 87 p 10

[Interview with NOVYY MIR Chief Editor Sergey Zalygin by Andrey Vasilyev: "NOVYY MIR Reorganized"]

[Text] "I have been Editor-in-Chief of NOVYY MIR for 15 months now, and I consider the magazine my most important creative undertaking..."

The work of Sergey Zalygin, Secretary of the USSR Writers' Union, is an indisputable success in our country and abroad. The print run has swollen from 500,000 to 1,100,000. Foreign interest in NOVYY MIR since its reorganization is evidenced by the meeting of the editorial board at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Press Centre with representatives of the diplomatic corps.

Naturally, diplomats were not so much interested in the personal plans of various writers as in the conditions under which literary periodicals have become more captivating. Thus, there was a focus on the editor and the questions asked were rather acute, some simple, for example, those about censorship.

"In the past 15 months there has been no major interference by censors in our work." Zalygin replied. "That was why I agreed to take this post."

One of the complicated questions was about opponents of perestroyka were waiting for mistakes to be made by its supporters, to capitalize on them. I remember that you replied that they have already got mistakes from you. What exactly are the opponents and what mistakes are meant?"

"I don't quite understand you," replied Zalygin, "why is this remark given such great attention? I simply said that everyone makes mistakes and this is quite natural. However, the opponents of my ecological works (which include people who occupy high posts) interpreted my words as a renunciation of my ecological programme. I had to deny this interpretation. Let me refuse [as published] the claim that we allegedly changed our attitude to Shmelev's article "Advances and Debts" by saying that the author is finishing a new article for NOVYY MIR.

"Incidentally, the main points of the magazine's programme for the next year have been published in its recent issues. To this we can add that on poetry the editors will stick to the magazine's traditional orientation and publish serious poems and avoid the superficial publicistic approach or elite avantgardism. Criticism will pass from exclusively literary to broader themes.

"NOVYY MIR will carry on publishing works shelved for years," Zalygin said. "To prevent them turning into purely polygraphical productions these works must be given our own literary critical commentary. Pasternak's novel "Doctor Zhivago", which is going to be published in the first four issues of 1988, will be completed in issue No 5 with other versions of chapters and a lengthy work, but they are the credo of the magazine founded by Aleksandr Tvardovskiy."

Sergey Zalygin worked with Tvardovskiy as an author for about 20 years. He replied to the question about continuing the traditions of NOVYY MIR by saying he would strive to achieve the level of his famous predecessor, particularly since working conditions are now much better.

"The issues with my work," he said, "came out sometimes with a delay of six months. The December issue is being brought out in November. To the question: did the newspapers write the truth saying that NOVYY MIR will carry a selection of poems by Joseph Brodsky, I can answer with, ease: Yes, they did.

Writer Abramov's 1964 Speech Published

PM161027 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Dec 87 p 6

[Abstract prepared by L. Krutikova-Abramova of speech delivered by writer Fedor Abramov at 24 November 1964 Leningrad writers party meeting: "'If You Hold Dear Soviet Literature'"; ellipses as published; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues" marking the 70th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution gave a profound analysis of the path we have traveled: of our achievements and errors, victories and tragedies. In particular Mikhail Sergeyevich said: "It is perfectly obvious that it was the lack of the proper level of democratization of Soviet society which made possible the personality cult, the violations of legality, and the tyranny and repressions of the thirties. To be frank there were real crimes on the soil of abuse of power. Many thousands of party members and nonparty people were subjected to mass repressions. That is the bitter truth, comrades. Serious harm was caused to the cause of socialism and the party's authority, and we must speak of this directly. It is essential for the definitive and irreversible assertion of Lenin's ideal of socialism."

Today's changes, fearlessness in assessing the past and present, have not arisen out of nowhere. They were prepared by the thought and deeds of the best sons of the fatherland. They included Fedor Abramov. We publish an abstract of his speech at the 24 November 1964 Leningrad writers' party meeting kindly given to us by the writer's widow, Lyudmila Vladimirovna. The questions touched on in the speech, which was called "50th anniversary of Soviet power and writers' tasks" are topical to this day, they chime with our time and confirm the high quality of social and civic activeness characteristic of F. Abramov's entire activity as a writer concerned with the most difficult and complex problems of our existence.

I. Assessment of the report [subhead]

Statistics. It is useful to learn what is being done in journals and editorial offices. But have our tasks become clearer to us?

Have our ideas about the 50-year path we have traveled—that is the theme of the report—become deeper?

Yes, many books will be published to mark the 50th anniversary—the publishing houses' plan for gross indicators will be fulfilled and even overfulfilled. But what kind of books will they be? Will they enrich the nation's spiritual life?

Extolling and praising. But should we gear ourselves to celebratory emotions alone? Perhaps we should also think, try soberly and calmly to look at the five decades we have lived through?

Are we not forgetting Lenin, who said that celebrating the revolution means above all focusing our attention on our shortcomings and on unresolved tasks?

The history of the first country of socialism is remarkable and unrepeatable. We have done a lot. We have something to be proud of.

But has our revolution been only the festive advance of an emancipated people (if the revolution is taken as a process continuing to this day)?

a) Yes, we smelt 84 million tonnes of steel, yes, we have constructed giant GES's and were the first to pave the way into space.

Yet we have completely neglected agriculture. And our people and our cities (if you do not count Moscow and Leningrad) go short of meat, butter, milk, and sugar from one year to the next.

We cannot blame the war here. We know that after the civil war Lenin was able (...) to feed the country.

b) We have won great victories over German fascism and we have displayed miracles of selflessness in the civil war. And what about our labor valor on the construction sites of the first 5-year plans?

We have raised a fantastic, unprecedented tribe of inspired people, people prepared to undertake any torment and sacrifices for the sake of the revolution.

But where are they, the renowned heroes of the revolution and the civil war? Where is Lenin's guard? It has been defeated and killed.

And here is the terrible thing: It has been killed in the name of the revolution. (...)

How could it happen that we were once unable to distinguish between the black deeds of the counterrevolution and the revolution?

How could it happen that we Soviet people, capable of any heroism, were mediocrities when the heroes of the revolution were killed before our very eyes? And our humanism? Yes, we are humanists. And our humaneness comes largely from the revolution. But what about the mass repressions in the country?

The extermination of the best farmers in the village as kulaks?

The destruction of the officer corps on the eve of the war (...)? How many millions of casualties did this cost our people during the Great Patriotic War?

How could the people, the masters of their own country, allow it? That is also the history of the first country of socialism.

c) Take our science and literature. "Quiet Flows the Don," "The Rout," and "How the Steel was Tempered" aree great achievements. And next to them are the writers' innocent victims. Has this ever happened before?

Biology. A leading science of the late twenties and early thirties. Some 3 or 4 reports at international forums were ours. But I read the work "Soviet Biology over 30 Years," and it is not the history of a science but the uncontained rampaging of the oprichnina [bodyguard of Ivan IV] and banditry. And that is our history too. How? Why?

d) And our school? Our Soviet school in whose successes we take such pride and whose achievements are recognized by the whole world. Yet, on the other hand, it is also our unfortunate school. There is no stability, no certainty, in textbooks or in programs.

And its permanent restructurings? Separate education for boys and girls, 11-grade and 8-grade school...

Who is responsible for this?

The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences? But why is it committing such excesses, why is it perpetrating acts of stupidity every year and organizing monstrous experiments whose pointlessness is obvious to any subliterate housewife?

Why is all this happening?

e) One more example. Our daily life. Who will deny the enormous successes achieved over 50 years?

New cities, unprecedented housing construction. Parks. Rest homes. Sanatoriums. Free medical treatment and so forth.

But here is a little picture for you. The Crimean coast. The beach.

People stand in line from 0400-0500 hours to get a small patch near the sea. They are packed tight, body to body. There is no room to swing a cat.

And next to this beach, on the other side of an iron fence, is a beach of the same size. A bathing place under a canopy. Sunshades. A lift.

And a fat, corpulent woman under a parasol, with the whole beach to herself.

Who is she, this woman? Why have such regal conditions been created for her?

Perhaps she is our national heroine whom, with their usual absent-mindedness, our newspapers have forgotten to tell us about? Perhaps she is a new Joan of Arc unknown to us to whom the country is indebted for its salvation?

But perhaps there was no point in diverting you to the Crimean coast. Why incur such expense?

After all, we can find similar pictures closer to hand, even in our own Writers Union.

One more question from our history—the cult.

We have exposed Stalin—that is a great victory. But how could it happen that after one cult another cult has grown up in our country, albeit not a bloody cult, not a cult marked by the crimes of Stalin's rule, rather a cult marked by anecdotes.

Yet this cult too has cost us dear. Take agriculture. What has happened? After all it has been a sheer game of chance. What has not been gambled with? Peat plants, agricultural cities, the reorganization of agricultural administration, the plowing of meadows, corn.,

Yes, something monstrous has happened.

Some kind of mystery play has been staged throughout the country. Sacrifices have been made to the idol in the form of the creation of enormous areas of land sown to corn—from the south to the Arctic Circle. On the best lands.

Have we not understood all the criminality of this? Why has it happened?

And what has happened to history? Stalin has been removed from everywhere and Khrushchev has been installed. Formerly all victories in the Patriotic War were ascribed to Stalin, now they are ascribed to Khrushchev.

The party's history has also been rewritten. Now a third history must be created.

Why is all this happening? Why? (...)

But must we discard all this when we look back over the path we have traveled?

Perhaps we should write not only of our victories but also of our defeats?

Perhaps we should supplement our usual palette—extolling and extolling—with sober consideration, with a calm and thoughtful analysis of how this becomes an honest Communist?

A man is celebrating his birthday. But a man is not worth a penny if he merely reads the telegrams of congratulations and does not think about how he has spent his life, what he has done well and what he has done badly. And what must be done in order not to repeat the bad things he has done.

It seems to me that we writers must also be in some way like that man.

The people are now literate. Stern romances on the subject of how good and fine you are, oh my people, are not enough for them. Drum rolls are not enough for them. The people want finally to understand what is good and what is bad in themselves. And we must help them in this. This is a task for the entire intelligentsia, because the intelligentsia exists to enlighten (a good word, that, enlighten, a word current among the intelligentsia of the 19th century), to make them more intelligent, humane, and civicly aware.

There is no other task for the intelligentsia. That is what it was created for.

II. About the October Theme and the Theme of Lenin in Literature and Art [subhead]

It is true. October and Lenin are themes which for decades now have moved the minds and feelings of artists and thinkers and will continue to move them for centuries to come.

These themes are inexhaustible. The new world chronicles its beginning from October. One way or another the light of October illumines all the great deeds of our century. That is axiomatic.

But I am not sure that every meeting should urge writers, as we are doing, to depict the theme of October and give us an image of Lenin.

First, these appeals proceed from a total misunderstanding of the writer's work. A real writer does not need to be told: Depict this. Depict that... We all know that such books are not worth a penny... And we must orient ourselves toward the real writer. The real writer writes what moves him, what he knows.

If our leadership wants to direct our attention and talents toward October themes, it should not address appeals to us. That is something which can be done in kindergarten, but appeals have no effect on a writer.

No, our leadership should endeavor to reveal these themes for us, to draw our attention to what is eluding us, in brief, to organize serious and useful talk on this subject. This could be of benefit, could kindle a spark in someone, generate a fire in a writer's soul in this direction.

Second, writers and artists must not so much be urged to depict this theme as reminded of the responsibility, the enormous responsibility, which they bear in addressing this theme.

The October revolution. Lenin. Easy to say. The pillars supporting the modern world. Our world outlook and our main love.

Are you prepared for this? Do you have sufficient understanding, civic courage, and boldness? Do you have a feeling in your blood for this material? For this era?

After all, I know writers who write on this theme. "How my own mother saw me off" is a primitive song for them. Yet it is one of the main songs of that era. Is it a challenge?

So, preparation!

Then—thought and talent.

There is "Quiet Flows the Don," "The Rout," and "How the Steel Was Tempered..."

Can you say something new about that rumbling era?

People will say to me: Ah, talent. What nonsense are you talking? Where is Sholokhov? Is a Sholokhov born often? What should we do, not write? Not depict?

No, you should not write, should not depict. And the people will not condemn you for it.

Who needs hack works? After all, they only compromise October. If you hold dear Soviet literature, do not worry: Talents will come which will take up this theme in earnest, because for these people the theme of October has become the main music of their lives. And they will write.

Third. About works on Lenin. This year sees the 40th anniversary of Lenin's death. Artists are being told: Write about Lenin. Create an image of the leader in art, painting, sculpture. Indeed they have produced canvases, sculptures, and prints., The artist has earned a lot of money. They have been praised. The organizers of this business have been praised. And what happens! The works lie in reserve. Millions of rubles of the people's money have been wasted. If with this money the artist had drawn meadow flowers, some cornflowers or weeds—what benefit that would have produced! The pictures would have given people joy.

But no one needs pictures with a hack portrayal of the leader.

This may be said of both literature and drama. Lenin is after all sacred to us. Yet what is being done? Dozens of masters in all theatres portray Lenin. Writers depict Lenin in every situation. Subjects include Lenin's laughter, Lenin the cook, Lenin and children (in all conceivable and inconceivable variations), Lenin the chess player, Lenin...

In brief, the universal trivialization of Lenin is taking place. The leader of the revolution is being turned into a scatterbrain, a kind of frivolous carefree optimist.

It is time to put an end to this.

The fathers of the church were not being stupid when they told their flock: Do not take the name of the Lord in vain.

That is what we should do too.

It is time to bar the way to hackwork and time-serving items and I, for instance, would like to hear the following appeal: "Dear comrade hack writers and self-seeking artists! You want to contribute to the celebration of the 50th anniversary of October? Please, have mercy on the October theme and Lenin. Seek your wages elsewhere—after all, you are pushing, skilled people. And it will be your best contribution to the celebration of the 50th anniversary of October. We need no other contribution from you."

Scholars, Writers Argue on Nuclear Retaliation

PM151001 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian
10 Dec 87 p 6

[Feature under the "Polemic": rubric including articles by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Begun and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Bovsh; Ales Adamovich; and Vasil Bykov; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] On 3 October this year the newspaper published a letter from a group of well-known writers from Minsk under the heading "Who Has Stolen the 'Lamp of Glasnost?'" In the letter they expressed their opinion of two articles published in the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee journal POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK (Nos 1 and 2 for 1987). The authors of the articles (one of them—"The Stolen Lamp of Glasnost"—was written by V. Begun and the other—"From Positions of Abstract Humanism"—was coauthored by Begun and V. Bovsh) disagreed with the opinion put by V. Bykov, S. Aleksiyevich, and other writers. V. Begun and V. Bovsh express their viewpoint in the article "Excommunication from Restructuring," which we offer for readers' attention. We also showed this article to Ales Adamovich and Vasil Bykov, who in turn expressed their disagreement with the position of V. Begun and V. Bovsh.

Excommunication From Restructuring [subhead]

Like many readers of POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK, we are surprised at the content of the letter from V. Bykov and other writers. Its authors' methods seem strange: refusal to ascertain the truth in favor of total obstruction, insinuations, an abusive tone, and overt attacks. While emphasizing their intolerance of labels, the authors themselves begin by appending the "tandem" label. It is hard to find a rational explanation for the desire to brush aside our arguments by means of strong expressions: "nonsense," "lapses of memory," "sticking on labels," "yesterday's thinking," "writings," "opuses," and so forth. The magic effect of these words leads to a comic situation: Our opinion is seemingly being debunked, and we are being "excommunicated" from restructuring without the right of appeal; that is the standard of their polemic. It has to be endured by the journal POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK whose editorial office preferred the quest for a new, dialectically strenuous, dialogue with readers to a semisomnolent existence.

How exactly did the journal and we, its authors, incur their anger? We think it was because particular group interests were stung to the quick, because we were encroaching on sacred territory, disrupting the authorities' calm existence. Thus we can understand the anger and illicit methods of the letter's authors and, of course, their desire to turn the matter in such a direction that we would have a good idea of the limits of the sacred zones and would keep further away from them in future. Of course, if we dared to count on this "future..."

A large part of the letter consists of a denunciation of us for criticizing the views of A. Adamovich on substantial aspects of the problem of war and peace. For instance, the authors claim that, following a group of Soviet Army officers who expressed their disagreement with the writer's concept, we are making a political denunciation against him. That is not true.

There is no need to discuss the importance of the range of problems touched on. "In all human affairs, especially international politics, we should not forget for one minute the contradiction that now dominates everything—the contradiction between war and peace, between man's existence and nonexistence." (M.S. Gorbachev. "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Humanism in International Relations". Moscow 1987). The nature of this contradiction, the dependence of its content on the specifically historical conditions of our era, and the fact that diametrically opposed forces are taking part in the struggle for its solution—in favor of peace or, conversely, in favor of war—makes inevitable the political assessment of any position, any statement on the question of war and peace. This is also reflected in our article. However, political assessment and political denunciation are different things, and they should not be confused.

The thrust of our polemic with A. Adamovich touched inparticular on retaliation for nuclear aggression, whose expediency is disputed by the writer both politically and morally. To show his logic more graphically, on the basis of his own idea we recreated precisely the sort of situation where the taking of a fatal decision is required inasmuch as the aggressor has failed to consider the right of the peoples, including the Soviet people, to life. Yet this decision is not taken. The situation we describe causes indignation in the letter's authors. The question is put "point blank," as they say, and we are asked: "In which book, article, or speech by Ales Adamovich did V. Begun and V. Bovsh find this nonsense?" We reply: We found it in A. Adamovich's article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI for 8 March this year, where the idea of retaliation for a nuclear attack is relegated to the thinking of the "prenuclear era" and rejected by the writer since retaliation would "finish off" mankind. It is this position that we criticize.

The philosophy of nonresistance (that is what we are dealing with in this case), whatever forms and nuances it may be given, has been and remains unfounded because it disregards objective realities. As a supporter of "the whole truth" about nuclear war, calling for "everything to be thought through," A. Adamovich, in our opinion, also overlooks questions of paramount importance or interprets them in a distorted manner. That includes the question of retaliation to a nuclear attack.

The truth about retaliation is that its irreversibility is a factor which can to a decisive degree prevent a potential aggressor from implementing his plans. Thus it is not a case of "finishing off" but, on the contrary, a case of saving mankind. One has to agree with D.A. Volkogonov that our readiness for a retaliatory strike is of fateful importance (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May 1987).

Of course, on its own the irreversibility of retaliation to aggression does not ensure lasting peace. For that it is necessary to eliminate war from the life of society, destroying forever its material attributes, including weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union's practical initiatives on this score are well known. Our new political thinking links a peaceful prospect for mankind with disarmament and peaceful coexistence between states, with the solution of other global problems in the interests of all mankind.

At the same time our new political philosophy based on Lenin's ideas is pervaded with concern for the defense of the socialist fatherland and the fraternal peoples' socialist gains. After all, "it is no secret," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress noted, "that there is a scenario for a nuclear attack on us." Hence our readiness for a retaliatory strike. That is also one of the realities that cannot fail to be considered by the new political thinking, and there are perhaps no objective grounds for relegating it to that prenuclear era, as A. Adamovich does. The authors of the letter should also agree with this conclusion and not accuse us of some kind of "complacency." From writers of all people we have the right to expect a responsible use of words, but

surely there is no evidence of this from the identification of "complacency" of will and society's determination to stand up for itself in the face of any threat? Is it permissible to have such a free-and-easy attitude toward exceptionally serious matters?

Nor can we fail to mention the humane aspect of the problem. A. Adamovich is inclined to see in the rejection of retaliation to nuclear attack an act of humanism. Can we agree with this position? Of course not. The point is that the realities of the nuclear age, if we are speaking of them in earnest, also leave their mark on our concept of humanism. It is becoming more active and at the same time extremely "condensed" and "concentrated," directing its entire charge at one target—the prevention of a nuclear conflict—because the chances of the human race's preservation depend directly on the prevention of the threat of nuclear war. Mankind only has to cross a dangerous threshold and talk of humanism loses any meaning. We will not entertain the illusion that it could be otherwise. Genuine humanism is indivisible.

People may object: In general it is a question of preserving life on the planet, and consequently humanism must at least be seen in that. Yes, life is worthy of defense by virtue of its uniqueness in the universe, but, once again, whose life?

Familiar with the "nuclear winter," A. Adamovich and the authors of the letter naturally cannot fail to be aware also of those people in the West who seriously hope to "winter out" this winter, and are therefore concerned not with the problem of preventing a cataclysm but with constructing fashionable shelters. Whether the writer wants it or not, A. Adamovich's "I wouldn't press the button" objectively accords with these gentlemen's interests. To be utterly frank, in this case we should be talking not so much of abstract humanism as of the most real cosmopolitanism.

To continue, we do not question either the fact that there are in our country admirers of the work of M. Chagall nor their right to show signs of attention to their idol. For us, as for many Soviet citizens, it is something else that is unacceptable—the commercial ballyhoo—which is no part of the cultural life of our country—raised around Chagall's name by some of his admirers and the arbitrary juggling with evaluations of the artist's work.

The true interests of the group of writers were revealed in that they are dissatisfied with the truth about Chagall in the article "The Stolen Lamp of Glasnost." We felt awkward saying this, but in the letter they used a lie—they claimed that "Begun sees in Marc Chagall a Zionist" and "identifies two completely different concepts—the national and the political," that is, he regards every Jew as a Zionist. Please, nothing of the kind is mentioned in the article!

But the lie was not used for no purpose, because another stems from it. Here it is: "This identification is a favorite theme of V. Begun's writings based on the pernicious concept of a 'world plot of Zionist sages' and masons. We think it is writings of this kind which serve as the 'theoretical' basis for the extremists of the notorious 'Pamyat' organization."

As far as the word "writings" is concerned it is an indicator of a poor standard of polemic. The standard is brought down still further by the malicious scandal about the "sages" and masons, which the Zionist press has long been repeating abroad. And 'Pamyat,' which is brought in without any justification, is the latest method of discrediting people you don't like. Some French paper recently named the artist I. Glazunov as the founder and leader of 'Pamyat.' He denied the slander and stated that in addition to individual adventurists "the members of 'Pamyat' include many good people—patriots of their country and of the Soviet people."

The letter from the group of writers also revealed something else. It turns out that it is impossible to tell the truth about the artist Chagall. Those who dare to recall even one negative fact are immediately besieged. The authors of the letter state that Begun "idolizes color photography and the 'strange' Chagall sickens him." We want to ask: Are you esteemed gentlemen not sickened by Chagall's portrayal of the leader of our revolution standing on one hand with his feet in the air next to a donkey? Do you consider it normal that persons unknown should telephone the undersigned and, in connection with A. Adamovich's criticism and the story of Chagall, insult and threaten them?

Initially, of course, no one could think or guess that B. Volodarskiy, who is mentioned in the article "The Stolen Lamp of Glasnost" and who mounted in his school drama circle a scandalous production based on M. Shatrov's play "Dictatorship of Conscience," would also be on sacred territory. It turns out to be the case. The same group of writers hastened to support B. Volodarskiy, although they have not seen the school production and do not know the state of affairs in the school. True, they attacked the author not for what was said in "The Stolen Lamp of Glasnost"—it criticized the show—but for the criticism of the play which was absent in the article. The writers know, of course, that enormous distances can exist between a play and a production, which is what happened at Minsk's No. 93 school, but that is not the main thing for them...

So who really has stolen the lamp of glasnost?

V. Begun, candidate of philosophical sciences,

Prof V. Bovsh, doctor of philosophical sciences.

If Not Us then Who? [subhead] [Reply by Ales Adamovich]

For some reason I do not want to make Bovsh and Begun change their minds or to prove that I am not an "anti-patriot" or a "cosmopolitan," and that I am not working for those who plan a nuclear death for us in the hope of sitting it out in their "comfortable shelters."

Nonetheless I am answering their letter. No, I am not answering them but those who are looking, hearing, and reading in perplexity and wondering: What are they really talking about?

After all, the question is indeed a complex one. Unless it is oversimplified in the desire to "catch" somebody. This, like everything to do with the old or new thinking, is not simple. The very process of choosing between the old and new thinking is sometimes a most difficult, most agonizing task. It is also a moral choice. It was this that was discussed at the forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, For Mankind's Survival" with which it all began, and that was also discussed in my article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and then at the Writers Union plenum.

Just 10-20 years ago everything looked simpler: If "they" delivered a strike—they would receive the same treatment. It had been calculated how many, what percentage, of the population would survive in each country. In our time, with our present arsenals and our knowledge of the consequences (especially the secondary consequences), it is obvious that no one will survive, not only in these two countries, but on the planet as a whole.

Indeed, more perceptive people were writing this even a decade ago. It was Jonathan Schell, in his book "The Fate of the Earth," which shook America and many people in other countries, who wrote:

"The country is being turned into a radioactive desert, but the means for delivering a retaliatory strike have been kept in silos, on bombers, and in submarines. These leaders, who no longer have anyone to lead, who sit in their underground bomb shelters or "judgment day" aircraft and cannot land, will wield the means of national defense, but the nation to be defended will no longer exist. What for them will be the purpose of delivering a retaliatory strike? As the nation no longer exists, the aim cannot be safeguarding 'national security.' Nor can the defense of other peoples be their aim, because a retaliatory strike could finally kill off the ecosphere and put an end to man's existence."

But retaliation could be their aim. Retribution for the unrivaled evil which has been perpetrated, a crime in retaliation for the first strike which will kill billions of people and doom the rest to an agonizing death.

That is usually what is emphasized. It is claimed that only this threat (retaliation) is keeping the aggressor from a "first strike."

Soviet and American scientists have published a joint book entitled "Breakthrough" ["Proryv"] (published in Russian by the "Progress" publishing house, Moscow 1987). You only have to read articles by the former and the latter to sense the prevailing conviction now in the world of scientists, politicians, and, perhaps, the military: The main threat is not the possibility of an aggressive planned strike from anyone but the mounting avalanche of unpredictable chance circumstances. Even the most reckless, who only 5-7 years ago were crazy for the idea of at least a "limited" nuclear war, have been cooled down and enlightened by the fact that no one can survive a nuclear war.

On the other hand, alarm has grown and is continuing to grow (the book proves this scientifically) over the fact that sooner or later a chain of computer and other chance circumstances will go to work and everything will crash into the abyss. While peace is maintained on the doctrine of retaliation we are all hostages to chance, as the Soviet foreign minister said when he addressed the United Nations. Chance is appearing as an increasingly awesome adversary to mankind.

The point is that this doctrine (of deterrence and retaliation) itself is not only absurd today, not only immoral, but also infinitely dangerous because it lulls everyone with the semblance of a way out of the situation: Good or bad, there's no war! Those people in the West who do not believe in the success of peaceful competition between the systems and those who are simply irresponsible gamblers in "national prestige" adhere openly to it.

Yet M.S. Gorbachev's speeches—at the Moscow forum, at the meeting with representatives of the Issyk-kul forum and with French public figures—stress precisely the immorality, danger, and hopelessness of this self-same doctrine of deterrence and retaliation.

To look at it and to assess it otherwise, to cherish it as Thatcher or Mitterrand does, as the Americans do (or as some people in our country do in the heat of polemic) means keeping people, keeping mankind, in a risky state of doomed anticipation: Will chance work or not, and in which direction this time? Over there they want to include space too in the system of fatal chance.

It seems to me we are living in an era when we should erect monuments not to the resolute but to the doubters. For instance, to those grass-roots workers of the CIA (well, it looks as though I'M laying myself wide open again!) who, during the Caribbean crisis, having received from their spy Penkovskiy "information" that the Soviet Union was "intending to deliver a preemptive nuclear strike," did not pass on to their superiors this falsehood of the utmost danger in that heated situation. Obviously fearing that there would be resolute... panic-mongers there, and if they had passed this information on, would it have been the last straw?!

Those operators and commanders, ours and Americans, who on so many occasions already have not taken the last step or made the last movement or given the last order, although all the "information" may have been crying out that enemy missiles were already in flight, already approaching!.. They did not press the button, realizing that if anything were to save mankind then it would be the order "don't shoot." So far that is how it has all been.

You want a writer to be "more resolute" than these military men, these "non-pressers of the button." If I am with any military men, then it is with them.

No, mankind has no alternative if it wants to survive: the total renunciation of suicidal weapons, of war! This is what our country proposed in its January Statement, and what seems to be beginning to be implemented: It is for this that M.S. Gorbachev has gone to the United States. Scarcely more than 10 years remain before the new millenium: Even that is too much, dangerously too much, for playing with the avalanche of chance circumstances when everything hangs from the single hair of the doctrine of deterrence and retaliation. A senseless situation.

Jonathan Schell was asked whether or not he would press the button "if the Soviet Union struck against the United States." He replied (to jeers from American "patriots," of course) that no, he would not press it!

If a writer or if literature were to press in the same direction as professional military men (they have their own tasks, their own phraseology, and I, for instance, would never venture to reeducate them in our writers' phraseology) then who will put on the brakes?

If not us, then who?

In conclusion the same thing is happening with the doctrine of deterrence and retaliation that once happened with the illusions about the possibility of victory in nuclear war. The main truth of the nuclear age has not reached everyone at once to this day: No victories, no awards and titles, no pensions for anyone. Yet how many dissertations by colonels and books by generals there are in the world about the future victorious scaling of "nuclear heights."

These people will not part immediately with the doctrine of retaliation either, even when the political mechanism of disarmament has been created.

Yet to create this mechanism and to avoid delaying this creation preliminary work is needed in people's souls and brains. Without seeing, without understanding all the immorality and dangerous absurdity of the doctrine now in operation, how many people will cling to it. Although it is already mortally dangerous to the human race.

Only by understanding this, by realizing and sensing it in all its depth, is it possible to declare a moratorium and to extend it many times (although this entails its own risk), to open up the most secret secrets inside one's own territory (also a risk), and so on and so forth. That is, to do what we are doing.

Because any risk is insignificant compared with the risk, the danger, the threat contained in the doctrine of retaliation.

Ales Adamovich.

Don't Excommunicate Yourselves [subhead] [Vasil Bykov article]

We realize from their signatures that our esteemed authors are scholarly people and inclined to observe a high standard of debate. There is political assessment and there is political denunciation, they write, and one must not be confused with the other. I add on my own behalf that there are also several genres of this nature, highly popular in their time.

The not so rare signs of their presence can be detected in the works (not the writings!) of our esteemed scholars, which undoubtedly expands the range of their scientific interests, but that is not what we are discussing now—we are discussing something far more important.

Probably many people can remember the last visit to our country by British Prime Minister Mrs Thatcher and her television speech when the "iron lady" with enviable restraint (which, incidentally, was lacking in our television journalists) set forth the British policy of deterrence based on the possession of nuclear weapons. The subsequent statements by our television commentators subjected this policy, undoubtedly unsound in our age, to justified and devastating criticism. A nuclear shot (and still more a volley) against an adversary is nothing other than shooting oneself, with all the absurdity of suicide, because there can be no victor in nuclear war. It is these elementary and irrefutable truths which for some time have been the official doctrine of our foreign policy, and it is these truths that are propagandized with enviable tirelessness by our writer and public figure Ales Adamovich.

What even slightly educated or sensible person in our time would seemingly start to dispute them and to assert the opposite? It seems that scholars and philosophers of this kind have been found in Minsk, as have press organs eager to give them the use of their pages, like the journal POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK, published in Minsk as well. "The truth about retaliation," our scholarly opponents write, "is that its irreversibility is a factor that can to a decisive degree prevent a potential aggressor from implementing his plans." Which is certainly an argument in favor of a state policy of nuclear deterrence.

Alas, there is not a hint here of the new awareness, everything here comes from the overgrown "stagnation" or "prestagnation" periods when sensations like the following were so customary and natural: "Yes, life is worth defending by virtue of its uniqueness in the universe. But once again, whose life?" the esteemed authors ask with striking naivety. The life of the human race, I reply, surely this self-evident truth does not still need to be explained to scholarly philosophers from the Belorussian Academy of Sciences?

I fully acknowledge that my esteemed opponents very much want to take part in the nationwide process of restructuring, in the active eradication of the errors and blunders that have accumulated over the decades and of which there are also many in Belorussia. The national language has been threatened with extinction and a number of figures of science and culture repressed in the thirties are still awaiting rehabilitation which, however strange it may seem, is being opposed with a persistence hard to explain by some of the scholarly colleagues of Begun and Bovsh. Some of them (like V. Shcherbin, for instance), without bothering to seek modern arguments, are rewriting from the archives, point by point, the accusations made by Yezhov and Beria against the repressed as though absolutely nothing had changed in the country in 50 years. The republic's public has for many years unsuccessfully been seeking the lifting of the absurd accusations against the Belorussian writer and public figure Tishka Gartnyy (just think: He took part in the funeral of his brother-in-law according to Christian rites (with a priest) and he dressed European-style (with a necktie!). But no, it turns out that this sphere of compassion and justice is not overly attractive to my opponents in the period of restructuring, give them something hot—new covert enemies.

It is well known that one of the signatories of the article above used to be successful in exposing world Zionism as the author of many widely known scholarly works (not writings!) containing very original thinking slightly marred, it is true, by a few borrowings from a well-known German "theorist" of the thirties. The other, his coauthor, is a man of astounding vigilance who has been able to recognize how, at the same time as restructuring, "certain world-outlook concepts are being put into ideological circulation—philosophical, esthetic, ethical, and even political concepts whose content far from always agrees with Leninism and is frequently its direct negation in favor of preaching either Zionism or pacifist views, or the introduction into society of other types of ideology alien to us." Right there, at the Minsk Belorussian Communist Party Gorkom plenum, he backs up his staggering observations with no less dismaying examples: "The poet A. Voznesenskiy acted as the initiator of the noisy campaign in connection with the birth anniversary of the modernist artist M. Chagall" and the author of a review of A. Rybakov's novel "Children of the Arbat" ["Deti Arbata"] "uses the bourgeois concept of Stalinism in a positive sense and approves A. Rybakov's treatment of our political system under Stalin, which has come under the malicious, anti-Soviet theory of the totalitarian society." From everything quoted above it becomes clear that Adamovich is not alone in the republic; there are also "ideological saboteurs" in Moscow and other cities and villages of our vast country, and beyond.

Matters regarding territories beyond our borders became of elementary simplicity as soon as the senile figure of Marc Chagall, whose centenary, by a UNESCO decision, was celebrated by the entire civilized world, loomed on the horizon.

In that sense what is surprising above all is that some modern Belorussian artists are making demands on Chagall which are surely only appropriate within their own creative union. But can they be allowed to forget that M. Chagall is an artist of what is after all a different artistic world, a man with a complex personal and artistic destiny with a special gift and a particular creative manner which has nonetheless been understood and accepted by the world, yet has not, unfortunately, been accepted in his motherland. All the numerous attempts by the public to achieve the organization of a museum for M. Chagall in Vitebsk or his native Liozno are to this day being dashed against the indestructible wall of ridiculous accusations like the accusation that Chagall is not one of us, he is a Zionist, because, you see, he painted a synagogue in Jerusalem. That his hand also painted the renowned Grand Opera in Paris, that his stained glass decorates the Rheims Cathedral in France and the UN building in New York, that he is a great artist of modern times whose entire creation was based on images of our own Vitebsk, that his poetry is filled with an unusually powerful nostalgia and anguish for the destiny of his motherland during the German fascist occupation—these facts are simply ignored by the champions of the thrilling exposure of the "truth about Chagall."

Indeed, never mind a museum! The struggle against Chagall in Belorussia has moved from the pages of POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK to the field of practical deeds and at an art exhibition in Vitebsk recently a sculptural composition was sawn up in order to remove the image of the hated artist from his colleagues in the Vitebsk school, to which he had given years of his work and his life.

As for the school production of M. Shatrov's play, I confess we have not seen it. We believed that it was enough that it had been seen by the school's perfectly mature and ideologically consistent teachers' collective, but allow me here to express surprise that the indignant philosophers have not seen it, surprise that their zeal to watch and control has extended so far from the Academy of Sciences—as far as school amateur artistic activity, where it turns out the intrigues of secret enemies are also to be found. There are enemies—Zionists, masons, writers—all around, and schoolchildren as well. Is that not too many?

Probably because they feel uncomfortable, they complain of "excommunication." Amazing, but noteworthy! The times have nevertheless changed strikingly, and it seems to me they are not doing too much to further the implementation of the esteemed philosophers' tendencies toward exposure and denunciation. The main thing is that it is hard to "get" anyone! Some people have died and for that reason have become unreachable, while others are snapping evilly in the central press. When has this been possible?

But it is possible now!

And will be for a long time, I believe.

So you will have to get used to it, esteemed authors of philosophical sciences.

Vasil Bykov.

From The Editorial Office [subhead]

And so a debate between two social scientists and two eminent writers is under way in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. A debate on problems that worry them, that worry us all and, we venture to believe, all mankind.

Essentially, if we discard the not over-delicate assessments of their opponents' positions and the inevitable and also entirely calculated inaccuracies in the authors' polemical statements, it is a case of their attitude toward the new thinking proposed by the Soviet leadership for an objective assessment of the extremely alarming present-day situation in the atmosphere of military arsenals' oversaturation with lethal nuclear weapons.

We have already written of the difficulties of mastering the new thinking. It is indeed hard to understand if you have not thought out profoundly and thoroughly your attitude toward stereotypes that were long ago established in your consciousness. To some extent the same thing is happening with the new thinking, or rather with the understanding of its principles, as once happened with Albert Einstein's theory of relativity. The new, fantastic, dependencies between time and space did not fit into the consciousness of people who for centuries, for generations, had believed the very great truths proclaimed by Newton's classical mechanics, did not fit into that "Newtonesque" consciousness. For a long time even major scientists refused to acknowledge them.

Where exactly, in what matter, lies the plane of the debate, and where do the sides' views, opinions, and convictions intersect? The two social scientists, V. Begun and V. Bovsh, frankly state, albeit not very elegantly: "The thrust of our polemic with A. Adamovich concerns in particular retaliation for nuclear aggression, whose expediency is disputed politically and morally by the writer."

We must look into this. Because, however the authors of "Excommunication from Restructuring" may disown after the event the fact that they wrongfully slandered a respected writer and Great Patriotic War veteran, it remains a fact that serious and unfair accusations were levelled against him and in the context of the debate arguments about some differences between "political assessment" and "political denunciation" seem casuistical.

In fact, the "abstract humanism" which Ales Adamovich allegedly preaches and the entirely religious "nonresistance to evil with violence" and "bourgeois pacifism" (as though there is proletarian pacifism!)—all this invective, although V. Begun and V. Bovsh call it "political assessment," is of the nature of political accusation.

Unless he feels the pressure of class-based adherence to the imperialist ruling clique and the military-industrial complex, it is now becoming clear to every normal, sane person that all military-strategic doctrines and concepts of imperialism, all so-called "scenarios" for a future war compiled in military headquarters are in their very basis absurd. Inasmuch as under present conditions—this has been proved by the most authoritative specialists—the actual aim of war is unattainable, victory is unattainable. Unattainable either to the hypothetical initiator, the aggressor, the person who delivers the first strike, or to the defending side, however crushing the retaliatory strike of retaliation. Only one "result" is attainable—collective, mass, total suicide.

In these circumstances, what is the meaning of the"active and at the same time extremely compressed, concentrated humanism" that our social scientists set against the ideas of Ales Adamovich and Vasil Bykov? It looks as though it is merely an attempt to avoid the real problem in dense thickets of words which mean nothing. If we are speaking of the activeness of a person, country, or people, then today it lies in purposeful resistance to war, in the merciless exposure of imperialist plans and the unrestrained arms race, in a portrayal of the senseless cruelty of war. On that plane our writers, among whom A. Adamovich and V. Bykov hold a prominent place, are doing a very great deal with their striking words and their artistic images achieved through suffering.

We can agree with the authors who acknowledge that "true humanism is indivisible." Precisely!

No, there is no "humanism of nonresistance," "abstract humanism" or concentrated "humanism." Humanism is not curdled milk which can be thinned with the boiling water of suspicion and slander.

Humanism is the WEAPON [published in uppercase] of our time, of our social structure, the most just in the world; a non-recoil weapon in the arsenals of Good and Truth.

That is the "imprint" which time leaves on our understanding of humanism.

Briefs

New Television Transmitter

A new relay transmitter has been brought into operation in Tselinograd Oblast, giving reliable reception of Central and Kazakh Television in color in Makinsk Rayon. [Summary] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 17 Dec 87 LD*]

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts' 'Fatigue' 'Building Up'

LD180406 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Excerpts] Another long space flight is drawing to a close. One of the two crew members aborad the "Mir" orbital station, Yuriy Romanenko, has established a new space endurance record. He has been in space for over 10 months. His flight engineer, Aleksandr Aleksandrov, has been working aboard the station for 5 months. Here is our science correspondent to review what they have accomplished:

[Correspondent] [passage omitted]

Now the crew are not concealing the fact that they feel the monotony of the flight by now, that their fatigue is building up. Even 2 days off no longer refresh them the way they did at earlier stages of the flight. This has indeed been a difficult flight in physical, moral, and psychological terms. You may wonder, in view of this, whether such prolonged space missions are really needed. After all, the working capacity of a cosmonaut after more than half a year in space does begin to decline noticeably. In this respect, the experts consider a flight of 4 to 6 months to be optimal, but scientists are also interested in the biomedical effects of a prolonged stay in space.

This problem is very important for the further development of space flight. Say, on a flight to Mars, the crew will be exposed to zero gravity for as long as 30 months. Can they endure this? Science still has no exact answer to that question, but it is seeking that answer. That is why Yuriy Romanenko's marathon flight has aroused such interest among scientists in many countries.

At first the crew had an official 8 and 1/2 hour working day, then it was reduced to 6 and 1/2 hours, and recently to 4 and 1/2. Night work has been stopped altogether. What is more, if the crew is unable to complete some job, mission control does not insist that it be completed that day and schedules it for the following day. Once a week, the crew have a communication session with their families and that, too, helps them in their many-months-long isolation from earth.

Now, what about their physical condition? The doctors are fairly pleased with it. Both cosmonauts now devote 2 and 1/2 hours a day to physical exercise, using their space bicycle, their treadmill, and the like. They are given 9 hours for sleep; they have three or four meals a day, and have several hours of leisure time. The latest medicals show that the body mass of the cosmonauts is the same as it was before their flight. In previous flights, crew members sometimes put on or lost mass but never more than 4 kilograms either way, which is considered normal. This time there have been no changes at all.

The high working capacity of the cosmonauts has enabled them to carry out a very considerable amount of research. Here are just a few figures: They have performed 587 astrophysical experiments, 78 experiments in materials processing, and 100 in geophysics. Their flight is now drawing to a close, and another crew is preparing for a launch from the Baykonur cosmodrome. They will continue work aboard the "Mir" orbital complex.

Ship Reaches Antarctic Despite Hitting Rock

LD180538 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Molodyozhnaya December 17 TASS—TASS special correspondent Nikolay Konstantinov reports: Though a collision with a submerged rock unmarked on maps in the Antarctic Sea of the Cosmonauts caused a few days' delay, the research ship "Akademik Federov" was still able to hack a path through heavy ice and reach the first stop on its itinerary—the Molodyozhnaya observatory on the Enderby land.

The crew last night began unloading machinery, scientific equipment, fuel and food there for the 33rd Soviet Antarctic expedition.

The ship's mechanics and divers had sealed cracks in its bow most skillfully. According to experts' conclusion, the "Akademik Fedorov" built by Finnish Rauma Repola specially for use in south Polar seas had not lost its sea-going and ice-breaking qualities.

This was confirmed by its passage from the site of the accident to Molodyozhnaya through a maze of icebergs and across an unbroken field of shore ice as thick as 1.5 meters.

After being unloaded here, the ship, in keeping with the program of its maiden Antarctic journey, will proceed along the coast of the white continent to the Soviet polar station Mirniy in the Davis Sea.

Military

Defense Minister Yazov Addresses Writers

PM181121 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Report by Colonel Yu. Velichenko and Captain First Rank V. Lukashevich: "Literature in Combat Formation: Meeting with Writers Has Been Held at the USSR Defense Ministry and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate"]

[Text] Those invited to take part in this joint discussion were committed people whose labor and talent had been devoted to the heroism and courage of the Soviet soldier, writers who have made and are continuing to make their personal creative contribution to composing artistic annals of the glorious history of the Soviet Armed Forces, the 70th anniversary of which we will be celebrating next February. The meeting was conducted by Army General D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense Minister.

Remarkable processes are underway in the world today, it was stated at the meeting. Our party's 27th congress demonstrated new political thinking based on a sober and realistic approach toward prevailing sociopolitical and military realities. The policy of military antagonism and military confrontation was recognized as a policy without a future. It was stressed that the arms race, like nuclear war itself, cannot be won. The Treaty on Eliminating Medium-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles just signed by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President marks an important step in really destroying the nuclear arsenals.

But does this mean that the very highest demands on the combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces, the need for Soviet servicemen's high standard of discipline, training, patriotism, and heroism, and their readiness, if need be, to sacrifice their lives to defend and uphold the gains of the Great October Revolution are becoming less relevant? Of course not. We do not aspire to greater security than other countries, but nor will we accept any less. The Soviet Union threatens no one and has no intention of attacking anyone. But our might and readiness to immediately repulse any aggressor and the military-strategic parity created through the labor and talent of the Soviet people impose a substantial limiting factor on imperialism's aggressive plans and potential to unleash a new war.

The picture of the man in the military greatcoat has changed today. This is due not just to the complexity of the modern equipment with which the Army and Navy are supplied but also to the socioeconomic transformations underway in our country. In defending the gains of socialism, our Armed Forces have become an authentic instrument of peace in the world. That is why the task of educating the rising generation in a spirit of selfless devotion to the ideas of October, loyalty to military duty, and continuity of the glorious combat traditions of their fathers and grandfathers is not just a task for the military department. It is a task for the whole state. The family, the school, social institutes, and the creative intelligentsia must be involved.

This was particularly discussed in the opening reports by Colonel General V. Mikhaylov and Colonel General D. Volkonogov. These produced a lively and committed exchange of opinions. The writers then delivered their speeches to the meeting.

It is a very good thing, Anatoliy Ananyev observed, that leaders of the Defense Ministry and the Main Political Directorate have found it possible to assemble us writers here for frank discussion, exchange of opinions, and advice on how to enhance the role of literature in the process of educating young people. I, as a magazine editor, feel that some writers are worried today by so-called nonregulation relations in military collectives. Of course, the sources of this disease are clearer to military men and career officers. But I think that the one of the causes is that the junior commanders's role in educating subordinates has declined. I am alarmed that young men who are poorly developed physically and immature sometimes come in to the army. Serious attention must be paid to the education of our young generation in the family, school, and secondary vocational and technical college. This is a nationwide problem. As for literature about the modern army and writers working in this sphere, greater demands must be made. The Army and its people, generals and other officers, represent a colossal fund of knowledge and highly sophisticated hardware and also, if you wish, professional scientists. The Army today stands on the line separating life from nonexistence; the Army today serves as an instrument of peace, as Colonel General Volkonogov rightly said. Our literature has much more to do to show all the variety of the Armed Forces' life. It must demonstrate new artistic thinking.

Vladimir Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board, also touched on the problems of literature's treatment of the life and combat training of the Army under modern conditions. Restructuring is now under way in the economic, political, and social spheres, he said. While, for example, the results of restructuring will not be felt immediately in economics, we writers already have glasnost now. The Armed Forces have now become more open to writers. The cliches and stereotypes developed over decades cultivated in literature images of cardboard soldiers and officers, but all that is behind us. The army theme must be approached today in a serious way. Real work will be found in army reality for a talent of any stature, since army and navy life represents an enormous stratum of our people's existence. But this theme has so far, unfortunately, been poorly developed. Do not take offense at me, comrade writers. I have also written about the Army, and I apply this criticism entirely to myself. Let us face the facts: We do not have a single book about the Army that has captured general attention. Nor have we learned how to make the reader aware of what works do exist: We have virtually no critics who are well informed about servicemen's life and service. This breeds incomprehension, ignorance, and all manner of literary tittle-tattle. As if we were unaware and unconvinced that those 2 years of Army service will form the foundation for the whole of life, make young people morally and physically healthy, and shape the personality of the citizen and patriot.

V. Karpov also touched on questions of restoring historical truth in regard to certain military leaders such as

Tukhachevskiy, Blyukher, and Yegorov and creating worthy literature about them.

Grigoriy Baklanov spoke about the heroism and courage of Soviet servicemen performing their international duty in Afghanistan. He particularly stressed that not just the fact of a brave deed is of educative significance for the young generation but the way we treat the family of those who have died, their mothers and wives. Indifference toward and disregard for those who have been wounded and crippled and the families of those who have died also educates, but only in a negative sense.

There is an exhibition of books published by the Military Literature Publishing House on display in one of the halls, said Grigoriy Baklanov. You are all familiar with them. If you compare these novels and stories with those that are now being published in magazines, you get the impression that some other war is being written about. But we must write about the war as it was. We must write about the battle won in 1945, about vanquished Berlin, and the rout of fascism. All this did not happen of its own accord. It was an unparalleled feat by the people and the result of their belief in justice and their own strength. The soldiers died for a just cause and the motherland. But today you find writers who try to prove that no one went to his death for this. They even go so far as to belittle the prestige of the frontliners. In an article entitled "Someone Else's Award," they tried to sully the name of another writer who had been through the war. No, comrades, we must not put up with this; otherwise, all our gains will soon be lost.

Viktor Rozov, dramatist, spoke in his speech about the heroic, patriotic education of young people. He noted with alarm that recently the attitude toward war invalids and veterans is in some places becoming indifferent and purely formal in nature. This does not help invigorate the large amount of work that frontliners are now carrying out among young people.

It is a strange business, Aleksandr Prokhanov said, but we are going through a period when our culture, in the shape of some writers, is trying somehow to "run down" the Army and impute nonexistent sins to it. That despite the fact that the Army in the period of so-called stagnation was thriving, worked conscientiously, and achieved strategic parity. A pacifist, abstract peace-making mentality, after all, would not have allowed us to talk with the United States as equals or achieve the signing of a treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles. Thus what we have here are patently strained interpretations. The defense mentality developed during those years constitutes a valuable source of our world outlook.

I have already spent 10 years writing my novel about the Battle of Stalingrad, said Mikhail Alekseyev. I feel somwhat awkward, even ashamed, that I have been unable to complete it. It is a very difficult work which is dear to my heart. I was afraid to begin it straight after the war, and I put it off until times were better. I wrote the novel "Soldiers" about the Kursk Bulge. But better times did not come. What is more, people began pronouncing the very word "Stalingrad" in a whisper. No, let us cherish all our 70 October Revolution anniversaries. After all, historical truth consists not just of dark spots but of shafts of sunlight, too. History must be written as it really was and not as some people would like it to be.

A number of decades have passed since Victory Day, but the long-suffering soil of Stalingrad is still disgorging its shrapnel. Recently, for example, Volgograd schoolchildren sent me a parcel of shrapnel that they had collected in the steppe outside the city. How this land must have been filled with metal!

Stalingrad is a symbol of our courage. It gave rise to our Great Victory. Military historians have much work to do if they are to put everything in its proper place.

The vivifying processes of restructuring which are taking place in the country, Mark Gallay noted in his speech, also apply wholly to the Armed Forces. For most of my life, I have been involved with the Army. Of course, the Army organism has certain ailments, too. But just because a novel like "One Hundred Days Before the Order Came" has appeared, one should not believe that it has studied all aspects of Army life or that mutual relations are like that in every military collective. There are a many attractive aspects to our army—it is a true school of courage and education.

Yevgeniy Dolmatovskiy drew attention in his speech to the fact that military commissariats still have not awarded Patriotic War orders to some frontliners. These are questions of a moral character, and the protracted wait for a merited award leaves its mark on veterans' feelings. The writer also drew attention to the fact that many people who fought only in the initial period of the war are, for a number of reasons, not considered to be real participants in it.

We all support truth, Feliks Kuznetsov said. But we do not all perceive it in the same way. Some people try to convey in the newspapers and journals only that part of the truth which is negative and refuse to see our whole path in dialectical terms. How can young people be educated correctly using half-truths like that?

The speaker emphasized the idea that military-patriotic education must be included more actively in the system of the people's general education.

Yegor Isayev spoke about the development of Soviet society in the period of postwar rebuilding. The Soviet Land's achievements in a comparatively short period are to our historic credit. Returning to the time of the war, the speaker noted that our victory was achieved first and foremost through the intellect and indomitable nobility of the people. Literature must not forget that fact.

The discussion which is taking place today, Army General D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, said, concluding the meeting, was initiated by you, the writers. I have in mind here the article in PRAVDA by Yuriy Bondarev, Vasiliy Belov, and Valentin Rasputin, who highlighted the fact that young people, particularly today, need high moral ideals and genuine spiritual values, not imaginary ones. Our Soviet literature has built up a rich creative potential for that, and it has materialized in novels, short stories, and poems. There is a legitimate bewilderment when the mass media sometimes produce publications and broadcasts that disorient young people spiritually.

It is necessary today to highlight the question of educating the future defenders of the motherland, beginning in childhood, in the family. In our country there are many families with just one child. It often happens in such cases that the parents, while concerned for the child's upbringing and education, do not teach him what real labor is and do not give him a spiritual grounding. Such softies join the army or the navy and do not know how to do anything. What is more, they do not want to do anything. The problem of so-called non-regulation relations begins first and foremost with people like that, for whom the ordinary soldier's work is too much of a chore. We shall not oversimplify this problem, of course, but it is with good reason that the Army is called a form of schooling. We are striving today to create the kind of united military collectives where mutual relations outside the framework of the regulations do not and cannot exist. Real progress is being made in this respect.

Our meeting, Army General D. Yazov went on to say, has raised the question of those missing in action during the Great Patriotic War. Can they all simply be considered as having died for the motherland or not? This is not an easy question and cannot be resolved at a stroke. Your works speak about them, too. I shall quote from the poem "Combat" by Yulik Drunina:

When, forgetting the oath, the two submachine gunners turned back in battle, they were caught by two small bullets—the battalion commander never missed.

The young men fell, face down in the earth, and he, staggering, ran forward. Only he who has never faced the machine guns will condemn him for those two.

Later, in the regimental staff dugout, silently taking the papers from the sergeant major, the battalion commander wrote to two poor Russian women that... their sons met a hero's death.

In the remote village a weeping mother read the letter to people hundreds of times. Who will condemn the battalion commander for that lie? No one will dare! [end quote]

A number of speeches, Army General D. Yazov continued, expressed different points of view on the acuvity of I.V. Stalin, particularly during the war years. A thorough and comprehensive assessment of that person and his activity was given by the party at its 20th congress and a well-reasoned account was provided in the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the joint ceremonial session of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. I personally believe that writers who produce books about the war should not avoid the historical truth. And the main truth is that we won, by the force of our social system, the force of our arms, and the force of our convictions.

There are many tasks facing us, the USSR Defense Minister said, but the first of those tasks is to have the kind of Armed Forces capable of safeguarding peace. Military service today has become more responsible and complex. The officer, soldier, and sailor standing by their equipment must maintain their combat skill and their uniform like the musician who improves by daily practice. Our common task is to inculcate in a young man a belief in his own strength and the strength of our Soviet state, a sense of profound respect, and ardent love for his socialist motherland. We have many vivid moral examples that could be used to educate the young generation. Is that not the case with the life of Lieutenant Aleksandr Stovba, for example, a young poet and internationalist soldier who consciously went to his death to give his comrades covering fire? There are quite a few examples of such selfless service to the motherland in the Army and Navy today. Writers should not overlook them.

Let us think and work together, the USSR Defense Minister said in conclusion, to ensure that love for the motherland and a readiness to protect it become an inalienable feature of our young people and all the rising generation.

Taking part in the meeting were Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, G. Markov, chairman of the board of the USSR Writers Union, and V. Yegorov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee culture department.

Soviets 'To Scrap' Nuclear Submarines in Baltic

AU181334 Paris AFP in English 1326 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Stockholm, Dec 18 (AFP)—The Soviet Union plans to scrap its nuclear-armed submarines in the Baltic Sea, a Soviet general told a Swedish daily published here Friday.

General Geliy Batenin told the communist daily NORRSKENSFLAMMAN that six Golf-class conventionally-powered submarines based in the Baltic since 1979 had not been operational for more than a year.

The 18 nuclear missiles on the submarines, now technically obsolete, would soon be dismantled, he said.

NOTES

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.